

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8608) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Rumsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8609) granting a pension to Marguerite B. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 16 employees of Shelby, Ohio, in favor of the Moses bill to increase the pay of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany H. R. 8549, granting increase of pension to Aaron Ready; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of Orange Township Grange, Hancock County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Mondell bill, known as the Lane reclamation plan; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of 18 voters of North Milwaukee, Wis., demanding that Victor L. Berger be seated as a Member of Congress from the fifth district of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Berkeley Post, No. 7, American Legion, urging adequate appropriation for the United States Air Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of 33,000 names, signed by soldiers, sailors, and marines of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the Emerson bill to give additional sum of \$300 bonus; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of N. J. Coben, of Baltimore, Md., favoring House bill 7702; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also petition of Clarence H. Witt, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the one-year payment plan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also petition of H. B. Wilcox, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the Kenyon bill, Senate bill 2202; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Charles A. Gareis, of Baltimore, Md., and George A. Durst, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the Moses resolution, Senate joint resolution No. 84, for increasing the salaries of post-office clerks and carriers 35 per cent; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., asking for the repeal of the revenue bill of 1918, H. R. 12863, known as the admission tax, increased seating tax, and the 5 per cent rental tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Resolution adopted by Pilgrim's Congregational Church of Merrimac, Mass., in favor of enforcement of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of John Bilsky and others, of New York, protesting against the Smith and Towner educational bills; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MURPHY: Petition of members of the Newgarden Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Winona, Ohio, asking that the bill before the House providing for compulsory military training be referred to a committee that is not identified with militarism; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of the Rite Form Corset Co., of New York, favoring the program of railroad legislation advocated by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8525 in support of the claim of Frank J. Simmons; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Illinois Association of Postmasters, of Taylorville, Ill., asking increase in salaries to all branches; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Harold R. Young and 250 others, of New York, requesting the repeal of section 904 of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rome Chamber of Commerce, by Lester C. Bush, of Rome, N. Y., protesting against the Plumb plan or any other plan which would tend to muddle up the railroad situation any further; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Elbert Miller, of New York, protesting against any bill to reduce the guaranteed price of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of Knoxville Iron Co., manufacturers of iron and steel bars and chains, by W. P. Davis, of Knoxville, Tenn., favoring tariff protection, especially on chains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### SENATE.

THURSDAY, August 21, 1919.

Rev. John Paul Tyler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O Lord God of our fathers, command, we beseech Thee, this day Thy blessing, Thy grace and wisdom, that in all that shall be said and done this day Thy name may be glorified, that justice and righteousness may prevail in our land and throughout and among the nations of the world, that the day of peace and good will may soon come to bless the sons of men. To this end bless us, keep us, guide us. Bless our President; bless our Nation and every home in it. We ask it in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules and list of papers, documents, and so forth, on the files of the Treasury Department which are not needed in the transaction of public business and which are devoid of historic interest or value, and requesting action looking to their disposition. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives thereof.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN presented memorials of Local Union No. 2312, United Mine Workers of America, of Dietz; of the Sheridan County Trades and Labor Council; and of Local Union No. 1384, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Sheridan, all in the State of Wyoming, remonstrating against universal military training, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Slovenic National Benefit Society No. 26, of Cumberland, Wyo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation prohibiting the admission to the mails of any matter printed in a foreign language, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the executive board of the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, favoring the extension of the Federal farm-loan act for the benefit of stockmen, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of Carpenters' Local Union No. 35, of San Rafael, Calif., and a petition of Typographical Union No. 21, of San Francisco, Calif., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Local Branch, Polish National Alliance of the United States of America, of Bremerton, Wash., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the secretary of the Joint Postal Association, of Spokane, Wash., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Manhattan, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Emporia, Kans., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PAGE presented a memorial of sundry members of St. Mary's Parish, of Brandon, Vt., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore and Oakland, in the State of Maryland, praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Woodfield; of Lodge No. 320 of Daisy, of Lodge No. 323 of Long Corner, and of Lodge No. 334 of Mount Airy, International Order of Good Templars; and

of sundry citizens of Woodbine, Lisbon, Union Ridge, Waterville, Hoods Mill, Mount Airy, and New Windsor, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the enforcement of prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I present resolutions adopted by Gold Run Camp, No. 1217, Modern Woodmen of America, of Lead, S. Dak., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAD, S. DAK., July 9, 1919.

Whereas the war now brought to a victorious close by the associated powers of the free nations of the world was above all else a war to end war and protect human rights: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we advocate the establishment of a league of nations. We believe that such a league should aim at promoting the liberty, progress, and orderly development of the world: be it further

*Resolved*, That we favor the entrance of the United States into such a league as may be adequate to safeguard the peace that has been won by the joint forces of the allied nations: be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Senators representing the State of South Dakota, at Washington, and to the Hon. William H. Taft, president of the League to Enforce Peace, 130 West Forty-second Street, New York. GOLD RUN CAMP, 1217, MODERN WOODMEN OF AMERICA. W. J. HARVEY, Clerk.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of Local Grange No. 95, Patrons of Husbandry, of Buxton, Me., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Waterville-Winslow Chamber of Commerce, of Waterville, Me., remonstrating against the enactment of "class" legislation and coercive methods in the railroad situation, and also against Government ownership and control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KING. I present a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Utah, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE.

I, Harden Bennion, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the attached is a full, true, and correct copy of senate joint resolution 2 as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 16th day of August, 1919.

[SEAL.]

HARDEN BENNION,

Secretary of State.

By JERROLD R. LETCHER,  
Deputy.

Senate joint resolution 2, favoring the establishment of a league of nations to enforce peace and promote the liberty, progress, and orderly development of the world.

Whereas the war now brought to a victorious close by the associated powers of the free nations of the world was above all else a war to end war and protect human rights: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (both houses concurring)*, That we favor the establishment of a league of nations of which the United States shall be a member. We believe that such a league should aim at promoting the liberty, progress, and orderly development of the world; that it should clinch the victory won at such terrible sacrifice by having the united potential force of all its members as a standing menace against any nation that seeks to upset the peace of the world: be it further

*Resolved*, That we indorse the course taken by the President of the United States as the recognized leader of this movement, and as the internationally acclaimed spokesman for the aspirations and ideals of the masses of mankind in personally attending the peace conference; be it further

*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Utah.

(Passed Jan. 17, 1919. Approved Jan. 27, 1919. In effect Jan. 27, 1919.)

Mr. KING. I present a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Utah, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE.

I, Harden Bennion, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the attached is a full, true, and correct copy of house joint memorial 2 as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 16th day of August, 1919.

[SEAL.]

HARDEN BENNION,

Secretary of State.

By JERROLD R. LETCHER,  
Deputy.

House joint memorial 2, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of an amendment to the bill introduced by Senator BANKHEAD in the United States Senate on December 4, 1918, known as S. 5088, also the same amendment to a bill introduced in the United States Senate by Senator SWANSON on December 5, 1919, known as S. 5098, also the same amendment to a bill introduced by Mr. SHACKLEFORD in the House of Representatives of the United States on December 12, 1918, known as H. R. 13354, and also to any other similar bills introduced in Congress, in order to provide a more equitable application of Federal aid for post roads in the sparsely settled States, and to provide a more reasonable time limit for the availability of such Federal aid.

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Utah, respectfully represent that:

Whereas there are pending in the Congress of the United States bills known as S. 5088 and S. 5098 and H. R. 13354, all of which provide for additional Federal aid for post roads under the terms of the act of Congress approved July 11, 1916, and commonly known as the Federal aid road act; and

Whereas section 6 of said Federal aid road act provides that the United States shall not cooperate in any road project in an amount greater than 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof; and

Whereas, although additional Federal aid for road building at the present time is highly desirable, nevertheless those States having large areas and relatively small population will be unable to avail themselves of the benefits of this act as amended to provide additional Federal aid without a disproportionate burden of taxation;

Now, therefore, your memorialists urgently request that the said bills, and any other similar bills which may be introduced in the Congress of the United States, be so amended that section 6 of the said Federal aid road act will provide that in those States where the average population per square mile of area is 100 persons or more, based upon the census of 1910, the United States shall not cooperate in any road project in an amount greater than 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof; and that in those States where the average population per square mile of area, based on the census of 1910, is less than 100 persons, the share of the United States shall be increased one-fourth of 1 per cent for each person, or major fraction thereof, less than 100 per square mile; and furthermore

Whereas section 3 of said Federal aid road act provides that so much of the appropriation apportioned to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall be available to such State only until the close of the succeeding fiscal year; and

Whereas on account of the said provision of section 3 of said act local conditions existing in some States render it practically impossible to comply with the terms of the act;

Now, therefore, your memorialists also request that said bills now pending in Congress, and any other similar bills which may be introduced, be amended so that section 3 of the said Federal aid road act will provide that so much of the appropriation to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall be available to such State until the close of the second succeeding fiscal year; and be it

*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be sent to each of the members of the congressional delegation from the State of Utah to the Congress of the United States and to each body of said Congress.

(Passed Jan. 31, 1919. Approved Feb. 6, 1919. In effect Feb. 6, 1919.)

Mr. KING. I present a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Utah, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE.

I, Harden Bennion, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the attached is a full, true, and correct copy of house joint resolution 8 as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 16th day of August, 1919.

[SEAL.]

HARDEN BENNION,

Secretary of State.

By JERROLD R. LETCHER,  
Deputy.

House joint resolution 8, petitioning the War Department of the United States Government to designate the Utah Agricultural College as a permanent site for a summer training camp of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

Whereas the policy of the War Department of the United States of America is to encourage the participation of its citizens in the movement for the defense of the Nation and especially to encourage the development of military training in the colleges of America in such a way as not to interfere with the training and efficiency of the students in the various professions and vocations of civilian life; and

Whereas one of the measures looking toward this end is the establishment of summer training camps for the college students of America looking toward the preparing of these students for military and technical leadership in time of war, it being the object in these training camps to concentrate into a short period of time, in order not to seriously interfere with the civilian responsibilities of the students, the military and scientific training necessary for proficiency in time of war; and

Whereas the Utah Agricultural College is recognized as possessing advantages necessary for the proper feeding and housing of men and for the supervision of the men in a moral and social way, and it is recognized that the location of the college in the center of the intermountain region makes it a convenient site for the purposes mentioned herein: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Utah (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the State Legislature of Utah hereby petition the United States War Department to designate the Utah Agricultural College, at Logan, Utah, as one of the permanent sites for the location of a summer training camp of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and the board of trustees of the Utah Agricultural College is



hereby authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the War Department or such other departments of the Federal Government as are necessary for the establishment and operation of the military training herein mentioned.

(Passed Mar. 13, 1919. Approved Mar. 18, 1919. In effect Mar. 18, 1919.)

Mr. KING. I present a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Utah, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE.

I, Harden Bennion, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the attached is a full, true, and correct copy of house joint memorial 5 as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 16th day of August, 1919.

[SEAL.]

HARDEN BENNION,

Secretary of State.

By JERROLD R. LETCHER,  
Deputy.

House joint memorial 5, petitioning the Congress of the United States to provide for the proper restraint, control, employment, and education of certain renegade Indians in the San Juan region of Utah.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the governor and the Legislature of the State of Utah, respectfully represent:

Whereas there is now and ever since the settlement of San Juan County, State of Utah, has been roaming over said county a renegade band of Ute Indians, which lawless Indians have never been confined to any reservation or governed by any law.

Nor have they been under supervision or restraint of any Indian agency, but at all times have been allowed to roam at will over said county, occasionally going to the agency at Navajo Springs, Colo., to receive their annuities, but returning immediately to San Juan County, where for many years and up to the present time they have indulged in the nefarious practice of killing cattle and sheep, the property of white settlers; breaking into and robbing sheep camps and the cabins of cattlemen maintained for the storing of provisions and other necessities for the protection and welfare of cattle and the range. They break into and rob sheep camps maintained by sheepmen; break into and pasture their horses on the farms of settlers, regardless of the destruction wrought. These lawless Indians kill and rob white settlers to the extent that in the last 25 years at least 30 people have been killed while engaged in pursuit of Indians to recover stolen property. None of those Indians have ever been brought to justice and they rob and murder among themselves without fear of punishment by the civil authorities.

They are constantly armed with high-powered rifles and supplied with plenty of ammunition. While so armed in February of 1915, when the arrest of one of their number was attempted, an encounter took place which resulted in the death of one white man, the wounding of a second, and the death of two Indians; and

Whereas at the present time there is very great danger of an outbreak between said lawless Indian band and the white settlers of that locality, which will inevitably result in the needless loss of life, both to the Indians and to the authorities who undertake to deal with them; and

Whereas the children of said Indians have never been trained according to the methods now employed by the Interior Department of the United States for the education of Indian children, and the children of said Indians can not be schooled according to such methods so long as they are permitted to roam without restraint of any nature, but, on the other hand, they continue to grow more defiant of law and more bold in the commission of crime, both among themselves and against the white settlers:

Therefore your memorialists, in the name of the people of the State of Utah, and particularly on behalf of the people of San Juan County, hereby petition your honorable body that these lawless Indians be taken in charge by the Government of the United States pursuant to laws and statutes regulating the Indian population: that they be confined to the Ute Reservation, or such other reservation as may be available for the purpose; that they be restrained from roaming at large as they have heretofore done and are now doing; that they be provided with such educational advantages and such employment as will fit them for proper living; and that such other necessary action be taken by the United States Government to control said Indians as will give relief to the people of San Juan County from further menace of the unlawful acts.

(Passed Feb. 21, 1919. Approved Feb. 24, 1919. In effect Feb. 24, 1919.)

Mr. KING. I present a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Utah, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE.

I, Harden Bennion, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the attached is a full, true, and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 3 as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 16th day of August, 1919.

[SEAL.]

HARDEN BENNION,

Secretary of State.

By JERROLD R. LETCHER,  
Deputy.

Senate joint memorial 3, urging the passage of a bill relating to reclamation projects for benefit of returning soldiers and sailors.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Utah, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the Honorable Secretary of the Interior has requested the immediate passage of a bill appropriating the sum of \$100,000,000, to be employed on reclamation projects for the benefit of returning soldiers and sailors; and

Whereas such an undertaking is not only commendable as a practicable recognition of a patriotic service rendered, but alike meritorious in that it would place unproductive land in the productive lists, a distinctively governmental function: Now, therefore,

Your memorialists do advise, recommend, and request that the measure herein referred to be passed by your honorable body with the celerity that its merit justifies, and thus meet a situation that has already arisen, the importance of which is being daily emphasized at every American port of debarkation.

It is directed that this memorial be enrolled and one copy sent to the President of the United States, one copy to the President of the Senate, and one copy to the Speaker of the House, one copy to the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, one copy to the House chairman of the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, one copy to the Senate chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, and one copy to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah.

(Passed Feb. 18, 1919. Approved Feb. 28, 1919. In effect Feb. 28, 1919.)

CUMBERLAND RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 8076) authorizing the county of Montgomery, Tenn., to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River within 7 miles of Clarksville, Tenn., and I submit a report (No. 154) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered at this time.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the county of Montgomery, Tenn., be and is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Cumberland River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, and within a distance of 7 miles from Clarksville, Tenn., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," and approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 8117) for the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near Falls, Wyoming County, Pa., and I submit a report (No. 155) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Susquehanna River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, and at or near Falls, Wyoming County, Pa., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 2850) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Humboldt National Forest, in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 2851) for the relief of Seth J. Harris;  
A bill (S. 2852) for the relief of Mary Holloman;  
A bill (S. 2853) for the relief of Jimmie Lou Martin; and  
A bill (S. 2854) for the relief of William Henry Coleman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2855) granting an increase of pension to James Ross; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2856) to encourage bank deposits by nonresident foreign corporations and nonresident alien individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 2857) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the extermination of fur-bearing animals in Alaska," etc.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2858) permitting certain employees of the Government to purchase supplies from the commissary stores of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 2859) granting a pension to Grace S. Zane (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2860) granting a pension to Nellie McCarten (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 2861) for the relief of the Davis Construction Co.; and

A bill (S. 2862) for the relief of the Sanford & Brooks Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2863) for the relief of the heirs of Stephen G. Burbridge, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 2864) granting a pension to Clint T. Littlefield;

A bill (S. 2865) granting an increase of pension to Jacob T. Martin; and

A bill (S. 2866) granting an increase of pension to Bowman R. Butcher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6810) to prohibit intoxicating beverages, and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### PROFITTEERING IN FOODSTUFFS AND WAR CONTRACTS.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I submit a resolution proposing an amendment to Senate resolution 159 and Senate joint resolution 92, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 171) was read, as follows:

Whereas there is widespread discontent due to the general belief that since our country declared war against Germany on April 6, 1917, there has been profiteering carried on by American citizens on an extensive scale; and

Whereas there is a very general belief throughout the country that the profiteering in foodstuffs and the necessities of life is in part responsible for the preposterous excessive cost of living prevailing in this country and for the growth of un-American theories; and

Whereas there is a general demand throughout the country that the persons, partnerships, and corporations engaged in making excessive profits at a time when millions of American families were sacrificing and suffering for the cause of our country, and millions of American youths were serving in the Army and Navy of the United States, all of whom were ready to make every necessary sacrifice—and, in fact, many thousands of them did sacrifice their health, their limbs, and their lives for the preservation and protection of America's honor—should be known to the public in order that the people of this country may have in their possession the names of the persons, partnerships, and corporations who took advantage of the distressed condition of their country during the war to amass wealth, as well as by such publicity to prevent a repetition of profiteering in any future crisis in the history of our country; and

Whereas the obtaining of evidence of profiteering is most difficult because such testimony must come in great part from those charged with such unpatriotic practices, but, nevertheless, there is in the possession of the Government such evidence, only obtainable by an order of the President of the United States, that would assist in detecting where and by whom excessive profits were made: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That Senate resolution 159 and Senate joint resolution 92, providing for the appointment of a committee to investigate the high cost of living, be amended by adding the following:

"*Resolved further*, That the President of the United States is hereby requested to issue, under the authority conferred on him by subsection (b) of section 14 of Public Statute No. 271 of the Sixty-fourth Congress, entitled 'An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes,' an order giving said committee full access to the income-tax returns of all corporations, partnerships, and individuals engaged in the large-scale production or distribution of food products or having contracts with the Government for the furnishing of military or other supplies.

"*Resolved further*, That said committee be authorized to annex to its report a list of all persons who were employed since April 6, 1917, by the Government either under a regular salary or on a one-dollar-a-year basis, to whom Government contracts were issued either as individuals or to any partnership or corporation with which said individuals were connected either as members, directors, or stockholders, showing also who, if any, of said individuals were connected with any governmental department having contractual relations with the partnerships or corporations of which they were members, shareholders, or directors, and, further, what profits the income-tax returns of said individuals, partnerships, or corporations having contractual relations with the Government or other evidence may disclose as to the extent of their profits; and

"*Resolved further*, That said committee annex to its report a list of all other persons, partnerships, and corporations who have had contractual relations with the Government since April 6, 1917, or who have been engaged in the large-scale production or distribution of food products, with the information hereinbefore requested regarding the profits derived by them from such contracts or in said production or distribution."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I request that the resolution be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

#### AMERICAN BOLSHIEVISM.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD two brief editorials on the spread of American Bolshevism in the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BOLSHIEVISM HERE.

WASHINGTON, August —.

The Republican Publicity Association, through its president, Hon. Jonathan Bourne, jr., to-day gave out the following statement from its Washington headquarters:

"Bolshevism has at last reared its hydra heads in the United States in an organized and declared purpose to subvert government, expropriate private property, and seize economic control of the Nation. Bolshevism has stalked into the open, financed and accoutered for a war on republican institutions, and flying under its red flag the blue banner of the President of the United States, which it wrested from weakening hands in September, 1916. Bolshevism selects for its shock troops the four brotherhoods of railroad employees. Euphemize it as they may, the demands, the attitude, the plan of campaign, the purposes, the means, the ends, the revolution threatened by the leaders of these four brotherhoods are each and all identical with the program laid down by the Bolsheviks of Russia for the overthrow of orderly government and a final resort to anarchy. The 'Text of labor's demand to operate the railroads of the United States' might well have been formulated by a Lenin or a Trotsky, and the language of the text exhibits a surprising familiarity with the Bolshevik creed. E. M. Jewell, one of the signers of the brotherhoods' ultimatum, is reported in an interview to have 'made it plain that the railroad workers mean business. He said that the wage-board program proposed in Congress could not be accepted,' and he boasted that 'the railroads will be tied up so tight they will never run again if that legislation is passed.' This is an open defy to the Government of the United States that unless the insolent demands of the brotherhoods are accepted as laid down there will speedily follow an economic revolution which can not but end in riot and bloodshed and famine in congested centers of population. Such is the fruit of the surrender of 1916.

"Through what instrumentality are the American people to function in accepting the challenge of the railroad brotherhoods? The administration has long been permeated with socialism and internationalism. In its perverted scheme of things nationalism is renounced and individualism is marked for destruction. Democracy is anathema, and free government is passing into oblivion. Since its accession to power March 4, 1913, the administration has consistently and indefatigably worked to array brother against brother, class against class, section against section, to the end, apparently, that out of the perplexities and confusion thus fomented all parties would turn to him who was the author of their distress as the persecuted children of Israel turned unto Moses. And this man would lead them not out of the land of bondage, but into the world of foreign entanglements and the straight jacket of a Nation gone mad.

"In the words of Marshal Joffre, 'The retreat must end. We must go forward.' The administration no longer yields to the forces of Bolshevism. It has become identified with that movement. Congress alone can turn the tide of battle for the restoration of a Government republican in form, of, by, and for the whole people. If the demands of the railroad brotherhoods are granted, then it follows as the night the day that the demands of some leaders of organized labor for the nationalization of every private industry will be affixed to the panel of every legislative door with a poniard.

"But whatever action the Chief Executive may take, be it inspired by the expediency of the hour, a belated attempt to redeem himself, or a wholesale abdication in favor of and to encourage Bolshevism, the Republican Congress will stand like Belgium against the Hun in this first onslaught against free government in America. It is this Republican rampart behind which the American people must mobilize their entire force to rid the land of socialism and internationalism in 1921. If we fail in that, government by law is at an end, and the European prophecy that the United States as a Republic can not long survive will have been fulfilled in something like a century and a half. Americans, rally to your Congress!"

#### REAP THE WHIRLWIND.

WASHINGTON, August 2.

The Republican Publicity Association, through its president, Hon. Jonathan Bourne, jr., to-day gave out the following statement from its Washington headquarters:

"Having sown to the winds, through the class favoritism, partisanship, and socialism of the President, it seems that the American people are now about to reap the whirlwind. On the eve of the election in 1916 a portion of the organized employees of the railroads demanded an increase in compensation under threat of tying up the transportation systems of the country in the midst of a critical period in our history. President Wilson surrendered under such circumstances and invited a similar movement on the eve of the election of 1920. By numerous acts he has catered to the Bolshevik element in our population, notably in his intercession in behalf of the Utah murderer, Holstrom, and the California convict, Mooney, both cases within State and beyond Federal jurisdiction. Partisanship he pursued to the extent of avoiding Republican assistance until national extremity forced its acceptance. Socialists have found favor in appointments and their theories have been placed in practice whenever opportunity would permit.

"The right of labor to organize and the right of labor to bargain collectively no one will deny, but there is a vast and vital difference between collective bargaining and collective dictation. The manner in which the four railroad brotherhoods demanded an increase of wages in 1916 was not collective bargaining. There were no two sides to the



discussion. There was not even allowed time for discussion. The Nation was threatened with disaster of inconceivable extent unless the demands were met within a specified time, and the President's single-track mind, forsaken by the boasted 'fighting blood,' yielded the dignity of the Nation to the demonstration of power—surrendered the rights of all to the demands of a few.

"Unfortunately time and circumstances did not permit a popular expression upon the President's policy of surrender to the organized few in 1916. Unfortunately there is in effect no practical form of national referendum under which the people of the Nation could express their views upon such vital questions as surrender of national sovereignty to the league of nations and surrender of national dignity to the demands of organized labor under threats of national disaster.

"But it is to be hoped in the elections of 1920 a means will be found of securing a popular expression. This can be done if a sufficient number of candidates for Congress will make the surrender policy the paramount issue in their campaigns. The Democrats must, of course, stand by the record they have made. If Republicans in the primaries and the general elections will denounce that policy and stand for orderly procedure, with due consideration of the rights of the unorganized producer as well as the organized transportation employee—the rights of the shipper as well as the carrier—then we shall have an issue upon which the people of the country may express themselves in unmistakable tones.

"If we are to have dictatorship by the heads of the four brotherhoods, if we must submit to each new demand when it is made and adjust all other business to the wishes of the one class, then the sooner we know it the better. Until such determination shall be reached, the country waits with anxious interest each new move made by the President and the only power to which he bends the knee."

#### LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President, I give notice that on Monday next at the close of the routine morning business I shall submit some remarks upon the league of nations.

#### AMERICA'S PARTICIPATION IN THE WAR.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I give notice that on Tuesday next, after the morning business has been concluded, I shall submit a few remarks on our participation in the war and the conduct of it.

#### METEOROLOGICAL CONFERENCE AT PARIS (H. DOC. NO. 197).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In view of the provision contained in the deficiency act approved March 4, 1913, that "hereafter the Executive shall not extend or accept any invitation to participate in any international Congress, conference, or like event without first having specific authority of law to do so," I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress and for its determination whether it will authorize the acceptance of the invitation and the appropriation necessary to defray the expenses incident thereto, a report from the Secretary of State with accompanying papers, being an invitation from the Government of the French Republic to that of the United States to send delegates to a proposed conference to be held at Paris on September 30, 1919, to consider questions relating to the reorganization of the service of the exchange of meteorological information, and for other purposes, and a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture showing the favor with which he views the proposed gathering and recommending an appropriation of \$1,500 to defray the expenses of participation by at least two delegates.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
21 August, 1919.

#### AFFAIRS IN COSTA RICA (S. DOC. NO. 71).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, on motion of Mr. LA FOLLETTE, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Senate of the United States:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of the 2d instant, requesting that the President inform the Senate whether Nicaragua has been and is now permitted, with armed forces, to invade and to threaten with invasion the territory of Costa Rica, or has permitted armed bands to organize or rendezvous within her territory for such purposes; and for what reason Costa Rica, a belligerent with the Allies in the war just ended, was not permitted to sign the treaty of peace at Versailles, I transmit herewith a report of the Secretary of State, answering the inquiries contained in the resolution.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
21 August, 1919.

#### LEASING OF OIL LANDS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2775, known as the leasing bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2775) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain.

Mr. FERNALD obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Harris	McNary	Smith, Md.
Borah	Harrison	Moses	Smoot
Brandegee	Henderson	Nelson	Spencer
Calder	Hitchcock	New	Sterling
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Sutherland
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Thomas
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Page	Townsend
Curtis	Kellogg	Phelan	Trammell
Dial	Kendrick	Phillis	Wadsworth
Elkins	Kenyon	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	King	Poinceter	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Kirby	Pomerene	Warren
France	Knox	Ransdell	Watson
Gay	Lenroot	Reed	Wolcott
Gronna	Lodge	Robinson	
Hale	McCumber	Sheppard	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

#### FEDERAL CONTROL OF INDUSTRIES.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, that my remarks may not seem to be disconnected, I hope that I may be able to conclude them without interruption.

Mr. President, problems of such stupendous importance are pressing for consideration and solution by this Congress—matters of such vital interest to our people and to the perpetuity of our Republic—that I deem it proper and imperative that each Member of the Senate contribute to the discussion of these questions all the light and knowledge he may possess.

The world seems to be in a state of hysteria. And unless the United States is to be drawn into the vortex, it is essential that this Senate refrain from hasty or impulsive action, and that it deliberate calmly and carefully on the issues of the hour. For weeks we have been discussing the league of nations and the treaty of peace with Germany—mighty problems, fraught with great responsibility, which may affect the peace, happiness, and safety of the Nation. It is not to this question, however, that I address myself, but rather to matters of a domestic nature, which I believe to be of far greater importance and of more vital interest to our citizens at this time.

Whatever the cause, we all must, and do, agree that the cost of living has mounted to an almost unprecedented height. People from every section and from every walk and station of life are clamoring for higher wages to keep body and soul together. Wages have been increased time and time again to a degree and standard higher than ever before known. And yet the cost of living keeps abreast and often a little ahead of the wage increase, so that no relief is given.

In this trying period of transition from a war to a peace basis the minds of men are full of uneasiness and distress. And in this mood of dissatisfaction they are ready to listen to any arguments or suggestions for relief, and are willing to accept theories and remedies that under normal conditions they would vigorously ignore and reject. I wish it were in my power to solve this great problem, so troublesome to the American people and the American Congress at this time. But it is beyond the conception of man to change these conditions in a moment or to visualize just what can be done by this Congress to bring relief. People are prone to forget that we have just passed through the greatest war in history; that we have taken 2,000,000 men for nearly two years from the farm, the factory, and desk and made them consumers in a large way instead of producers; that we have been destroying property of all kinds instead of preserving it; and that we have been using all the food material in this country not only for our own people but in attempting to supply the Allies and the peoples of the other nations of the world. And in returning to a normal peace basis naturally the country is in a state of great industrial upheaval.

Always, criticisms are first aimed at the Government and its officials. From many sources we hear unjust and unfair remarks about the administration, both military and civil, during

the period of the war. It is not my intention to join this army of critics, because we have the great satisfaction of knowing that whatever may have been done, whatever the errors that have been made, we have been the one Nation of the earth to do more than any other in bringing the World War to a successful conclusion. That success is sufficient warrant for the outlay and sacrifice.

After faultfinding with the Government and its officials we are apt to take the greatest industry of the country and find fault with that. So there was stirred up in this country the feeling that the railroad owners were going to take charge of the country. And this aroused the belief that the railroads should be taken over by the Government and come under the Government control. This feeling became universal, so much so that the Government was given control, with most disastrous results. Now, I do not wish it understood that I am criticizing the Director General of the Railroads. I assume that the Secretary of the Treasury and those in control of the railroads did as well as could be done by any Government officials. But it is a shining example of the inefficiency that attends anything controlled or operated by the Government. And now there is a loud demand by the people of the country that the railroads be returned to private management. And this I assume will be done at the most opportune time.

After the railroads, critics began their attack on other large industries. And now it seems very popular to complain against the packing industry—or the packers, to be more explicit—because it has grown to be an industry of gigantic size. It is not my desire to defend the packers of this country except so far as I deem them in the right. I realize that it is perhaps somewhat unpopular to stand here in the defense of any large business of this country, because we are told that profiteering is going on to such an extent that men in all lines of business should be taken from their usual vocation and dragged into court, there to be sentenced for unlawful profiteering. I wish it to be understood at the start that wherever there is any unjust or unlawful transaction I desire every man sentenced to the extent of the law. I shield no man, nor attempt to, who is hoarding or who is juggling the business affairs of this country. But any man who is carrying on a lawful business—I care not how large nor whether it is big or little—I stand ready to defend. It matters little to me whether that man is a millionaire or a peanut vender; if he is in the right, I am his friend, and ready to stand by him.

In this spirit, knowing something, as I do, about the packing business of this country, I propose to lay before this Senate some facts which, perhaps, have not before been made public; to open the book and tell the story, so far as I know it, of the development of the meat-packing industry.

On June 23 the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] introduced a bill "to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes." On the same date the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] introduced a bill with the same title. These bills applied to the Government control of the meat-packing business and the packers, and I assume were designed to control the business for the so-called "Big Five." I do not know why these 5 should be singled out any more than the 10 large packers, because there are many packing concerns, of course not so large as the 5 first mentioned, but in reality there are nearly 100 which could be mentioned among the large business concerns of the country.

A little later the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] introduced an amendment to the Kenyon bill, making the proposed license system apply to any business. And this amendment is quite consistent and in line with the proposed legislation in the other bills. Certainly if one line of industry is to be under Government control and subject to the dictates of the head of a department, all business should be treated alike. And we might go even further. We might undertake to control not only all of the business interests of the country, and every business man be told by some clerk of the Government what he should do, but surely some of the professional men should be under the same control, because certain professions are now so closely affiliated with the business interests of the country and the fees charged are so exorbitant, that it would seem to me that they, too, should be placed under the same restrictions.

However, I do not believe that this is to be the policy of this Government. I can not believe that the Senate of the United States feels, after the experience we have had with the Government control of the railroads and telegraph and telephone lines, that that policy should be continued. It would certainly lead to chaos and commercial bankruptcy.

I have referred to two bills—the so-called Kendrick and Kenyon bills. And before proceeding I wish to state that there is little difference between the two, except that the Kenyon bill covers a little broader field, and it increases the salary of the commissioner of foodstuffs from \$6,000, as proposed in the Kendrick bill, to \$10,000. Also, as I stated, the Moses amendment proposes a license for any and all business. I believe I have fairly stated the import of these bills. And while I shall discuss the measure in general I shall endeavor to confine my argument as closely as possible to the meat-packing industry.

I have been associated with the packing business for a third of a century. And while I do not profess to know the details of the meat-packing business, my own business—the packing of vegetables—is so similar that I realize the significance of the published statements of the large packers and the explanations they have given of their business before the congressional committees. I know that this vast industry which Congress has singled out for drastic legislation is no different from other large industries; and if the license is to be applied to them it should in all fairness be applied to every other business in the country.

I believe that the meat-packing industry as carried on by the great packers is the most efficient, economic method of turning live stock into meat and of getting meat into the hands of the consumers. A comparison of the present situation with the conditions that obtained 50 years ago gives some idea of the remarkable benefit that the modern method of meat handling has been to the country. I believe in discussing this particular branch of the packing business the people are entitled to know the truth and the whole truth, and that in bringing the matter to their attention it will clear up some very erroneous ideas that possibly may be in the minds of the Senators even at this time.

No business has experienced a greater evolution than that of the meat industry. Every man in this Chamber recalls the old days of meat slaughtering, when every butcher did his own work. There was no division of labor, only a few animals were handled at a time, and the conditions under which meat was dressed were not of the best. The meat was inferior in quality and the by-products were thrown away. Before the development of live-stock raising in the Middle West each community was supplied with animals raised within a short distance. And since cattle were raised more for milk than for beef, a large part of the beef supply under the local system was composed of dairy cattle, which furnished an inferior grade of meat. Corn feeding was practically impossible before the agricultural development of the Middle West. But with the development of the great Mississippi Valley and the Western States and the raising of cattle and hogs in large numbers, they could be produced more economically than in the East because of cheap land covered with excellent grazing material, and, finally, of much better quality because of the development of corn culture. In those days live stock had to be shipped to eastern centers of consumption in stock cars of the railroads. This meant that freight on whole animals had to be paid; and in the case of cattle only a little over half of the animal was meat. This also resulted in deterioration of animals, shrinkage in weight, and deaths of large numbers in transit. It required many days in the sixties for a freight train to make the trip from the Middle West or West to the Eastern States. It also meant that those parts of animals which could not be used for food were thrown away, because of the inability to make use of by-products.

But the beginning of the modern packing industry took place in Chicago about a half century ago. Mr. G. H. Hammond, Mr. G. F. Swift, and Mr. P. D. Armour were among the first to realize the possibilities in the slaughtering of animals in or near the producing sections and the shipping of dressed meat to eastern markets. They were men of great vision, and wrought much better than they knew. They were men of insight, and foresaw the great possibilities for the packing industry. They realized that the great plains and ranches of the West would be the sections where the live stock would be produced, and that it would be more economical to establish the modern packing houses near these producing centers and ship the dressed meat to the large eastern sections rather than to ship the live animal. But there were great difficulties in the way; insurmountable obstacles confronted them. The modern refrigerator cars were unknown, and there was a prejudice among eastern people against western beef. The railroads had live-stock cars and refused to lend any assistance to aid the development of the refrigerator cars. They preferred to carry on business in the same old way, make no change, and refused to alter their cars to give to the industry the development which the first founders saw and predicted. So it was left to these men not only to perfect suitable cars for the carrying of meats, but they were



compelled to actually build, own, and operate the cars. It is not realized, I am sure, how much perseverance and courage was necessary to overcome such difficulties. But as a result of that determination, genius, shrewdness, ability, and efficiency which is and has been characteristic of American business men we have to-day one of the greatest industries in the world—in fact, a business so large that it is the marvel of the nations of the earth.

From a small investment of a few dollars, with no equipment and insanitary methods, they now have hundreds of millions of capital invested, the most modernly equipped plants, where many thousands of people are employed, and where the meat and other products are handled in the most sanitary and scientific manner. This is another result of American initiative, American genius, and American thrift.

But the great development of this industry has brought with it tremendous responsibilities. The packer has his troubles, and his path has not been strewn with roses. And what I have to say of the meat industry applies to the packing of vegetables and every other product on the face of the earth. The packer to-day occupies an unenviable position between the producer, who wants his prices high, and the consumer, equally anxious to buy his products cheap. To serve and to satisfy both is in itself a problem.

One of the greatest achievements of the packing industry has been the utilization of by-products. It was several years after modern packing houses were established before it was learned by scientific investigation that the unused parts of the animal, which were at that time hauled away and discarded, could be used for various purposes. And it was not until the eighties that the utilization of by-products began, so that to-day there is very little waste. I do not know exactly how many by-products result from the packing of meat, but from some investigations which I have made there are more than 40 by-products from cattle, 25 from hogs, and about 20 from sheep. And there are scores of minor by-products which are used as raw material in making hundreds of articles by hundreds of industries.

A good description of the early development of by-products utilization is found in the testimony of J. Ogden Armour before the Senate Committee on Agriculture in February, 1919. His statement is as follows (p. 12):

During the decade from 1880 to 1890 Armour & Co. continued to expand rapidly as new fields of endeavor opened up. It was during this period that the utilization of by-products began, and the development of that part of our business more than any other factor accounts for our being engaged in so many industries which at first glance seem unrelated to meat packing.

In 1880 the firm found a satisfactory outlet for beef suet by beginning the manufacture of oleomargarine. Two years later methods were found for using blood, bones, and meat scrap. In 1884 the firm engaged in the glue business, so as to have an outlet for great quantities of animal material that in the past had been wasted. The following year the firm was able to put a high-grade pepsin and a beef extract on the market, and in the years that followed ways and means were found to utilize everything in or on a meat animal.

I assume that you know the economic aspects of this by-product development, how it has enabled the producer to get more for his meat animal and the consumer to pay less, proportionately, for his meat. The big packers are to be credited with this development, for without their quantity production the by-products industry could not have been developed. For example, 5,000 steers must be killed before we can produce 1 pound of posterior pituitary substance, from which is made pituitary liquid, a drug valuable to prevent shock after a wound is sustained. Needless to say, small packers could not produce many pounds of pituitary liquid, because by the time they have killed any considerable number of animals the pituitary glands from the first animals killed have ceased to be usable.

Permit me to say here that this drug was used to great advantage by the medical fraternity in the World War, and probably saved thousands of lives. And it could have been produced in no other way except by these packers slaughtering such enormous quantities of cattle that they were able to manufacture this valuable liquid.

Referring again to Mr. Armour's statement, he says:

From 1890 to 1900 the firm continued growing and expanding. We entered into the manufacture of dry sausage largely for export in order to better utilize coarser cuts of meat, which while perfectly good and wholesome in every way did not lend themselves to sale to best advantage on the market. We went into the fertilizer business primarily to utilize the great quantity of packing-house waste. A similar reason caused us to enter into soap-making industry. Both of these latter businesses have long since ceased to depend upon packing-house waste for raw material, but for all that we regard them as important phases of our business.

One of the most notable results of by-product utilization in the case of cattle, for example, is the fact that all the meat from a steer can be sold by the packer for much less than he pays for the live animal. According to the statement of Swift & Co. for 1919—and they are among the largest packers in the country—they paid an average of \$92.70 per head for cattle in the year 1918, but sold the meat for \$81 per head. In addition to this \$22.06 was received for by-products—total receipts \$103.51 per head, as compared with \$92.70, the amount paid for

the live animal. This left \$10.81 for expense and profit, and the statement shows that only \$1.02 per head for profit was allowed. I understand that that is equal to about  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent per pound. That seems an unbelievably small sum to charge as profit. I understand that it has been claimed that the packers do not correctly credit the by-products to their beef business; but it seems to me that even if their profit were several times that much, it would be a very small item in the family meat bill.

The by-product business alone has become one of great proportions in this country. Many edible foods are manufactured, and this means that meats can be sold at lower prices as compared to the cost of live animals than would otherwise be possible. It means more than this; it means development of new industries, the employment for more labor, and the satisfying of more wants. To my way of thinking the discovery made by packers that by-products that were thrown away could be utilized for splendid food is one of the greatest achievements of modern times. But these by-products can not be utilized effectively unless the packing industry is organized on a large scale, or when it is concentrated in large markets. If it were not for the big volume of business done the packer could not sell the meat as cheaply as he does to-day; because volume permits him to utilize all by-products, and the packer makes his profit on these by-products alone and not out of the dressed meat. The small packer, especially if he is in the country districts, is at a disadvantage in this respect, as he can not utilize to the same extent the by-products as the big packer can, because he does not have sufficient volume of business to justify it. But the small packer in a large city does not suffer to such disadvantage as he formerly did, for there is a fairly good market for by-products that he himself can not utilize.

In the development and growth of this business no one appreciates more than I the advantage of producing in a large way, because I have had the experience. I started in the packing business in a very small way, with one small factory producing but a few thousand cans per day, and by economy, hard work, and patience my business has grown to the operation and management of eight canneries, handling the products of many towns, and with little extra expense in office work or what might be termed overhead charges.

And while I am discussing this phase of the subject, Mr. President, I want to consider the large packing business. Some complain that the companies are too large. I understand that the author of one of the bills, Senator KENDRICK, bases his argument for Government regulation on the fact that they are national and international in scope and therefore ought to be curbed by the Government. I think the most important fact of this matter is that the packing business has to be conducted by large establishments. As I have already suggested, a very large part of the live stock is raised in the Middle West and a majority of the consumers are located in the East. This makes it necessary in this particular line to assemble the live stock for slaughter on a large scale near where the cattle are raised and for the packer to provide a distributing organization for getting the meat and by-products in the hands of distant consumers.

I have heard it said that the small packer can not provide a selling organization which will distribute fresh meat all over the country in carload lots. I do not see why a small packing business should be expected to maintain branch distributing houses in all cities of the country. It must take a large output to maintain a lot of branches. As a matter of fact, small packers are by their size limited very largely to a local business. Only large packers can take care of long-distance business that requires much organization and equipment. I do not see that it will be any benefit to try to boost small, poorly equipped firms into a large-scale way of doing business for which they are not fitted.

So that when this proposition is viewed in its proper light I think it will be found that the present organization of the packing industry really meets the needs of the situation in this country and results in efficiency. It also remains to be proved whether the large packers are not in active competition. I am inclined to believe their statement that they have no agreements, especially as there is no positive evidence to the contrary. I believe this because in my own State, where we pack a particular style of goods that can not be produced in any other section to compete with us, there have never been any gentleman's agreements nor combinations to control that business, and the packers in the State of Maine are in sharp competition with each other. I can not understand how the packers would dare to make these statements if they were not true. I can not understand how they would dare to have any agreements, even if they wanted to, in view of the constant investigations and surveillance of their industry. Common sense tells me that

they would not be foolish enough to run the risk that would be involved in agreements.

The so-called Big Five packers, I am advised by the investigation I have made, handle less than 40 per cent of the total meat production of the country, and only about 70 per cent of the output of the inspected packing houses, which ship goods in interstate commerce. The largest packer handles only about 12 per cent of the total meat supply and only 22 per cent of the output of inspected houses. In 1918 there were 884 packing houses having Federal inspection outside of those owned by the five largest packers. This number does not include hundreds of packing houses doing an intrastate business which are not under Government inspection.

I understand that the smaller packers are fairly prosperous; that they are not only making money but steadily increasing their volume of business. Some of the so-called small packers are very large size, as, for example, Kingan, Dold, Hermel, and many others, who do a large interstate and foreign business.

Those who criticize the five largest packers on account of their size should remember that in many important industries there is one single corporation that handles a much larger percentage of the total output than is the case in the packing industry. For example, I refer to the United States Steel Co. (Inc.), the Standard Oil Co., the International Harvester Co., the Continental Wall Paper Co., the American Woolen Co., and so forth.

There are some who declare that the packing industry should be composed of small units instead of large. The small packer is not in a position to render the same service that the large packers do. The large packers undertake the expense not only of slaughtering and dressing animals but they pay freight on goods to all parts of the country, operate branch houses, have their own salesmen, accountants, expert meat cutters and handlers, and so forth, and even deliver considerable into the hands of retailers with their delivery trucks.

Instead of restraining packers and undertaking to tell them what they should do, in my judgment, they should have more liberty; and if they were permitted to divide territory, it would save a great expense which is now incurred. For instance, in small cities of thirty or forty thousand inhabitants we find from 5 to 10 packing houses who have warehouses, offices, clerks, bookkeepers, managers, handlers of beef, stock drivers, and so forth, that could all be readily handled by one concern; and 5 or 6 men could easily do the business that is carried on by 30 or 40. This, of course, can not be done, because it would be said that they were in restraint of trade, and so they are obliged to keep this large force of employees to satisfy the law. Possibly this is best. In fact, probably it is best; because combinations might be made that would be detrimental to the interest of the consumer. But from the standpoint of economy great expense could be saved; and if this expense could be used for the benefit of the consumer, millions of dollars might be turned his way.

The small packer has to pay relatively little for freight and selling expense, because he sells his goods locally or buys through a wholesale dealer in a distant market. In other words, large packers perform a much more extensive service and a very necessary one, and consequently you can not safely compare their expense with the expense of the smaller packer who performs a lesser service.

I feel that there is room, and a great need, for both the small and large packer. From testimony given before the House and Senate committees last winter the small packers are not complaining; for at those hearings they said that they had been prosperous; that they had not suffered from the competition of the large packers; and that they were opposed to legislation regulating the packing industry. And I want to say that I have received letters from very many of the smaller packers of my State opposing these bills. Even the Federal Trade Commission in its report on profiteering made the following statement with regard to the small packers:

The independent packers, as measured by results compiled for 65 of the largest of them, earned during 1914, 1915, and 1916 a rate of profit as high or slightly higher than that earned by the big packers in those years.

One of the best illustrations that I know of, which demonstrates the efficiency of large business units, is the splendid service the packers rendered during the war. They did a big job, and they did it in a big way. I doubt, Mr. President, if many realize what a vital part the packers played during the war in keeping the Allies and our own countrymen fed, which was one of the necessary services in winning that contest.

I believe the records will show that there is no industry in the country that performed a greater service. They had such a perfect machinery, organized on a national and an international basis, that they were able to take care of war demands perhaps more promptly and efficiently than any other industry in the country. Their efficiency in this respect alone is one of the best

arguments that can be found for the present organization of the packing industry on a large scale.

The following export figures in round numbers give some idea of the tremendous quantity of beef and pork products sent abroad as a result of the war:

	Beef products.	Pounds.
In 1914	-----	148,000,000
In 1918	-----	590,000,000
	Pork products.	Pounds.
In 1914	-----	921,000,000
In 1918	-----	1,600,000,000

In this connection I want to speak a word with reference to the National Canners' Association, which was called upon and used in a great many capacities by the different Government offices. Because of the fact that perishable food could not be taken to foreign cantonments in any other manner than in tin cans or cold storage, it can readily be seen that the canning industry had to put forth its utmost efforts throughout the war to meet the Government requirements. This is evidenced in the report of Mr. Benedict Crowell, Assistant Secretary of War and Director of Munitions, in which he says:

We literally paved the way to Berlin with tin cans. We used more than 1,000,000,000 cans. Enough, standing on end, to make a road wide enough and long enough for a force of men marching in columns of four to go from Hoboken, N. J., to the heart of Germany.

Yet these men who produced this quantity of canned food have been declared in this Senate a menace to the country. As between them and their accusers I shall leave you to judge.

Early in 1918 representatives of the Army and Navy attended the annual convention of the National Canners' Association, which was held in Boston, and urged maximum production of canned foods in every possible way. The industry was strained to its utmost. And owing to the officially established price of wheat, which automatically established in the minds of farmers a minimum expectation of acreage return, it was forced to pay the farmers a largely increased price for all of its raw products.

The Army and Navy, fearing that the price to be paid farmers for raw tomatoes could not be controlled, issued a bulletin February 28, 1918, through the Food Administration, stating that they would be unwarranted in making any award for canned tomatoes, or tomato products, based on raw material prices in excess of certain amounts.

This bulletin brought forth earnest protests from farmers, and the matter was taken up by the United States Senate, with the result that the bulletin was withdrawn.

In 1918 the requirements for the Army and Navy were placed through the Food Administration direct with individual canners. The authority for the Food Administration placing these commandeered orders was through the direction of the Food Purchase Board. The individual canners were required to readjust their plans from time to time as the needs of the Government became apparent.

In April, 1918, the canners were instructed to hold for the Government 15 per cent of their season's production of peas, corn, and tomatoes. On July 30 these percentages were increased to 25 per cent of the peas and corn and 33 1/3 per cent of the tomatoes. On September 27 the new percentage of tomatoes was increased to 45 per cent. The original commandeer of string beans was 25 per cent, and this was later increased to 40 per cent of the entire pack.

One of the Big Five packers alone shipped 760,000,000 pounds of meat and meat products during the year ending November 1, 1918, to the American Army and Navy at home and abroad and to allied nations and their armies and civilians. This amounts to 25,000 carloads of meat, which would make a single train 200 miles long. This same company shipped as many as 1,000 cars for Army at home and for overseas shipment in a single week.

What might have happened to ourselves and to our allies during the war had it not been for this wonderfully well organized and efficient industry? What if the Big Five had been divided into three, four, or five thousand units? Does anyone believe they would have had the organization and equipment to have rendered such service? It is difficult to imagine how many millions of troops in Europe could have been adequately fed without the organization of the packers. We know that in many wars in the past armies supplied themselves by foraging in the country through which they were passing. But during the European war millions of men had to be supplied with meat from points thousands of miles away. This was all done quickly and efficiently, and there were no complaints as to the wholesomeness, the cleanliness of the food, or of the service rendered, and not a single death has been reported from this source. If there had not been an efficient machinery in operation at the beginning of the war, the accomplishments in this direction would never have been possible.



I want to dwell at some length on the subject of the profits made by packers, because I think that that is one of the controlling facts of this industry that you have to consider in connection with the proposed legislation.

The history of the agitation which has culminated in these bills is that the live-stock producer has complained from time to time that his economic condition has been injuriously affected by fluctuations in prices of live stock, resulting in severe losses. It has been repeatedly, in fact continually, charged that the losses which the live-stock raiser has at times suffered have been due to extortionate profits taken by the large packers. It is the hope of those back of the proposed legislation that Government control will so regulate the profits of the packers that these losses in the raising of live stock will be avoided.

It therefore appears that there is expected from this legislation a reduction in the difference between the price of the live animal and the price of meat and by-products; so that the live-stock raiser will be enabled to get more for his live stock, and the consumer to get his meat at a lower price.

I believe that it has been generally conceded that the packers handle their business in an efficient manner, and with a proper economy of expense.

Our experience with Government control of railroads and telephones certainly gives no hope that under Government regulation the expense of conducting the business would be reduced. The only hope, therefore, is that there can be a substantial improvement made in the economic status of the producer and consumer through a reduction in the profit made by the packers. That is in the minds of those who are urging this legislation as being the cure to be applied to the situation. The Federal Trade Commission has laid great emphasis on what they call extortionate profits taken by the packers and, in my opinion, have gone to great lengths to mislead the country as to the real situation, with the result that after more than two years of investigation the general public is yet without reliable information presented so as to disclose the effect of the packers' profits on the producer and consumer. The general public have been misled by the quotation of large figures of total profits into the belief that the packers have made extortionate profits and have, in fact, seriously affected prices of live animals and meat by reason of excessive profits.

There is, however, no lack of evidence to show that that is not true and that the real facts show profits so small as not to affect prices appreciably. For one year ending November 2, 1918, the packers were under the supervision of the Food Administration, their profits during this time being covered by certain profit restrictions. Their books and records were also under the close supervision of the Federal Trade Commission, who had a force of men located in Chicago in daily touch with the books and records of the packers, which books and records were subject to their inspection.

The Food Administration has made an annual report as to the operations of the five large packers during this year, from which I quote the following figures:

Total profit	\$40,594,935
Investment	\$714,187,204
Profit percentage on investment	5.6
Sales	\$2,434,113,430
Profit percentage on sales	1.6

## FOUR LARGE PACKERS.

Statement showing sales, profits, and per cent earned.

Year.	Armour.			Cudahy.			Morris.		
	Sales.	Profits.	Per cent profit on sales.	Sales.	Profits.	Per cent profit on sales.	Sales.	Profits.	Per cent profit on sales.
1909	\$225,000,000	\$7,127,925	3.17	\$84,420,765	\$1,464,952	1.74	\$160,000,000	\$2,071,339	1.29
1910	250,000,000	5,817,720	2.33	93,315,696	494,117	.05	140,000,000	1,627,994	1.16
1911	250,000,000	5,510,053	1.00	87,903,855	379,307	.04	140,000,000	1,036,746	.74
1912	285,000,000	5,701,646	2.00	90,443,970	1,129,465	1.25	160,000,000	1,812,653	1.13
1913	350,000,000	6,028,197	1.72	104,408,789	1,329,178	1.27	175,000,000	1,916,967	1.10
Total, 5 years	1,360,000,000	27,185,511	2.00	460,393,075	4,797,019	1.04	775,000,000	8,465,729	1.09
1914	375,000,000	7,509,908	2.00	109,121,449	1,402,016	1.28	150,000,000	2,205,673	1.47
1915	425,000,000	11,000,000	2.59	116,162,156	609,242	.53	160,000,000	2,321,415	1.45
1916	525,000,000	20,100,000	3.83	133,960,966	3,011,415	2.25	250,000,000	3,032,212	1.45
1917	575,000,000	21,236,362	3.70	184,811,000	3,851,994	2.08	300,000,000	5,301,071	1.77
1918	861,000,000	15,247,897	1.77	286,660,971	3,376,808	1.18	372,000,000	4,217,858	1.13
Total, 5 years	2,761,000,000	75,151,307	2.72	830,716,542	12,251,475	1.47	1,232,000,000	17,678,229	1.43
Total, 10 years	4,121,000,000	102,336,818	2.48	1,291,109,617	17,048,494	1.32	2,007,000,000	26,143,958	1.30

Is there any other business of like size and like investment in this country that shows so small a percentage of profits allowed on the investment or on sales as does the five large meat packers of the country? These figures cover the operations in the slaughtering of live animals and the distribution of meat and by-products therefrom, and, under the Food Administration rules, include all profits that legitimately belong to the meat industry.

I want particularly to call your attention to the fact that the profit on the investment was only 5.6 per cent and on the sales 1.6 per cent; that is to say, 1.6 cents profit on each dollar of sales.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. FERNALD. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I think for the sake of accuracy or clarity it ought to be stated that this profit realized by the packers of 5.6 per cent is not the profit upon the capital of the packing companies, but represents a profit upon every dollar invested or employed in the business. That is to say, if a packing company has a capital of \$10,000,000, and then borrows \$100,000,000, the profit represents 5.6 per cent on all the money thus employed. So the packer first pays the interest on his borrowed money and charges that as expense. That capital has once borne an interest burden. Then upon the money he thus borrows he makes a net return of 5.6 per cent. So money which he borrowed at 6 per cent has to bear the ultimate burden of 11.6 per cent.

I am not saying for the present that that may not be proper, but I would not want it to appear that a packing company had made only 5.6 per cent upon the capital stock of the company.

Mr. FERNALD. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. GRONNA. Will it disturb the Senator to be further interrupted?

Mr. FERNALD. No; I yield gladly to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I think it is generally understood by everyone who has investigated this matter that under the regulations made by the Government the packers were allowed to make a profit of 2½ per cent on their turnover, and that they made a profit as stated by the Senator from Maine. Is that correct?

Mr. FERNALD. I think that is correct.

Mr. SMOOT. It is also true that they did not make the 2½ per cent allowed by the Government.

Mr. FERNALD. No; they did not.

Mr. REED. That is to say, the Government regulation was so high that the packer could not reach it.

Mr. FERNALD. I will come to that later.

Mr. REED. So Government regulation does not seem to promise much in that respect.

Mr. FERNALD. In 1918 the packers were under a great many restrictions imposed by the Food Administration, and it might therefore be claimed that the profit resulting from operations in that year did not reflect the normal conditions of the industry.

I have had prepared a statement which I would like to introduce covering the sales and profits of the four large packers—Wilson & Co. figures not being available—for the last 10 years.

## FOUR LARGE PACKERS—continued.

Statement showing sales, profits, and per cent earned—Continued.

Year.	Swift.			Total four large packers.		
	Sales.	Profits.	Per cent profit on sales.	Sales.	Profit.	Per cent profit on sales.
1909.....	\$250,000,000	\$8,025,000	3.21	\$719,420,765	\$18,689,216	2.60
1910.....	250,000,000	7,050,000	2.82	733,315,696	14,989,831	2.04
1911.....	275,000,000	6,137,500	2.23	752,803,855	10,063,606	1.34
1912.....	300,000,000	8,250,000	2.75	835,443,970	16,893,764	2.02
1913.....	400,000,000	9,250,000	2.31	1,029,408,789	18,524,372	1.80
Total, 5 years.....	1,475,000,000	38,712,500	2.62	4,070,393,075	79,160,789	1.94
1914.....	425,000,000	9,450,000	2.22	1,059,121,449	20,567,597	1.94
1915.....	500,000,000	14,087,500	2.82	1,201,162,156	28,018,157	2.33
1916.....	575,000,000	20,465,000	3.56	1,483,960,966	47,208,627	3.18
1917.....	875,000,000	34,650,000	3.96	1,934,811,000	65,066,627	3.36
1918.....	1,200,000,000	21,157,277	1.76	2,719,660,971	43,999,780	1.62
Total, 5 years.....	3,575,000,000	99,809,777	2.79	8,398,716,542	204,890,788	2.44
Total, 10 years.....	5,050,000,000	138,522,277	2.74	12,469,109,617	284,051,577	2.28

I want particularly to call your attention to the fact that for the first five-year period their sales were \$4,070,000,000, the profits \$79,000,000, or 1.94 cents per dollar of sales. For the second five-year period—the war period—their sales were \$8,399,000,000; profits, in round numbers, \$204,000,000, or 2.44 cents per dollar of sales. The lowest rate per dollar sales was 1.34 cents, the highest 3.36 cents. It is true that the total amount of the packers' profits has increased from \$79,000,000 for the first five-year period to \$204,000,000, but their volume of business has more than doubled.

I have to confess that I can not see how the packers can have injuriously affected the economic status of producer and consumer by taking such extremely small profits.

I doubt if there is any large industry in the country which does business on such a narrow margin of profit. To me these facts absolutely show that packers' profits have little effect in keeping meat prices high or in keeping live-stock prices low. The difference paid these two would seem to me to be as low as is possible. Only large volume of business makes it possible to operate on such a small margin of profit.

We all realize that the price of all commodities at present is higher than ever before experienced. I can not find that meat prices are in proportion any higher than the prices of other commodities. It would be interesting to consider how the economic status of the producers of live stock is to be benefited by the proposed legislation. It has been shown by some of the packers—Swift, I think, more particularly—that 85 cents out of each dollar of sales is paid for the live animal; 13 cents for labor, freight, and other expenses, and only 2 cents was profit. You will note that 13 cents went for freight, labor, and other expenses. It is undoubtedly true that the packer is paying regular rates for transportation of his meats. A reduction of these rates is a matter that can not be affected by the proposed legislation. The packers' expenditures for labor and other expenses can be reduced only by greater efficiency.

Keeping in mind our experience with railroads and telephones, I think you will have very grave doubts as to any saving being made out of the packer's expenditures for labor and other expenses by this legislation. This leaves only 2 cents, which the packer retains as his profit. This 2 cents is less than one-half cent per pound, and amounts to about 90 cents per capita, based on the average consumption of 182 pounds of meat per capita of production per annum.

I do not believe that the consumers of this country or the producers want to try the radical experiment of governmental control of industries if that is all the saving that can possibly be made. If you can not reduce materially the packer's expenses or his profits, then the only way you can get lower-priced meats is to pay the producer less for his live stock.

At this point I want to show the other side—that the economic condition of the producer and consumer has been tremendously helped by the initiative, energy, and efficiency of the packers in keeping abreast of an expanding industry by preparing the products of live stock with the highest degree of skill and energetically finding a market for them throughout the world and in this country, so that in every village and town, and even in country districts, it is possible for the consumer to secure full supplies and wide varieties of all kinds of meat products, delivered to him in the very best of condition.

This widespread market for products has made possible the present vast size of the live-stock industry. There is no country in the world that has such an efficient and energetic instrumentality in getting live-stock products to market as the packers have furnished the live-stock raisers of this country.

I think, Mr. President, that the principal reason for this legislation and the agitation that is going on in some quarters against the packers is due in some respect to an investigation conducted by the Federal Trade Commission, and I want to go into that question for a little while.

The investigation of the packing industry was started by the Federal Trade Commission in the summer of 1917. It was started on instructions from President Wilson:

To investigate and report the facts relating to production, ownership, manufacture, storage, and distribution of foodstuffs, and the product or by-products arising from or in connection with their preparation and manufacture.

The letter from the President containing these instructions was dated February 7, 1917. But what has the Federal Trade Commission done since the President gave these instructions nearly two and one-half years ago? The fact is, the commission has investigated meat industries only, and only that part with which the packers are concerned. No attempt has been made to investigate live-stock prices or the cost of live-stock production, and no study has been made, so far as I know, of retail distribution.

When the investigation began it bid fair to be an impartial one. But all of the packers declare that it soon developed that the Trade Commission was seeking only such information as it could use, by distorting facts and by adroit interpretation, to make out a case against the packing industry. The investigation was a one-sided affair. It was an *ex parte* proceeding. To start with, the commission employed an attorney who was at that time a candidate for office, and who sought throughout his employment with the commission to gain all the publicity and notoriety possible. He had gained his reputation as a prosecuting attorney and he began to perform in that capacity for the commission.

The packers insist that prejudiced witnesses were sought out to testify against them. They were not permitted, however, through legal counsel, to cross-examine these witnesses. They could not produce witnesses who, through cross-examination, would controvert the evidence of prejudiced witnesses, nor were they permitted to cross-examine witnesses of their own, to substantiate the facts which they might have produced. It is true that representatives of the packers might have appeared at these hearings, but since they would have been subject to cross-examination by a hostile attorney, and since they had no right of cross-examining witnesses themselves, or through counsel, they naturally did not care to submit to any unjust procedure.

In further support of my contention that these hearings were unfair, I call your attention to the significant fact that Mr. Colver, of the Federal Trade Commission, admitted to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, December 19, 1918, that the hearings had been *ex parte* in character.

The packers further assert that other questionable methods of procedure were used by the commission, when their agents went through the private files of the packers and selected only such parts of correspondence as might appear to make a case against the packers. They say a letter here and a letter there,



scraps of paper, were taken from the files while the hearings were being held, and these read into the record, not only without adequate explanation but with misleading insinuation and wrong interpretation. All of these were given at once to the newspapers, which resulted in sensational items being printed which inflamed the public, and is responsible more than anything else for the prejudice in the minds of the people against the packing industry.

This report of the Federal Trade Commission, as far as I have been able to investigate it, contains no evidence of monopoly. I am reliably informed, Mr. President, that the commission in some instances actually used only such parts of telegrams taken from the files of the packers as appeared to bear out its case, omitting items from the same telegrams which were not useful evidence to the commission.

So here we have an agency of the Government, constituting itself mainly as a prosecuting body, losing sight very largely of its function in the aid and guidance of business. The Federal Trade Commission, in place of cooperating and being of some assistance, has, and is now, badgering, harrying, and heckling American business interests.

Mr. President, instead of interfering with the business affairs of the country every Senator on this floor ought to be trying to encourage business, and in those splendid States of the South there ought to be erected this year more than 100 canneries to take care of their products. Instead of that, however, no development is being made along these lines.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to some statements contained in the summary of the report of the Federal Trade Commission, wherein monopoly and collusion is charged. These statements are made in a letter to President Wilson, written by W. B. Colver, then chairman of the commission. The report is dated July 3, 1918. Here are some of the statements Mr. Colver makes:

First. It appears that five great packing concerns of the country—Swift, Armour, Morris, Cudahy, and Wilson—have attained such a dominant position that they control at will "the market in which they buy their supplies, the market in which they sell their products, and hold the fortune of their competitors in their hands."

A little further on in this letter Mr. Colver further states:

Some independent packers exist by sufferance of the five, and a few hardy ones have survived in real competition. Around such few of these as remain the lines are drawing in.

On last Monday, August 18—and I am glad the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is present—Mr. Colver went before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and practically reiterated the charge to the committee contained in his letter to the President. He declared:

We have found that there are five great meat-packing corporations in this country, which, independently and collectively, control the meat-packing industry of the country. There are many independents, some of considerable size, many smaller ones. We find that these independents, in so far as they do exist, exist at sufferance, and as you become more familiar with these reports I think that that will be as clear to you as it seems to be clear to us.

But now let us see, Mr. President, whether that is the truth or not. Only yesterday a number of independent packers appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and these men's testimony discredits absolutely the report of the Federal Trade Commission as well as the statement made by Mr. Colver no longer ago than last Monday. There were eight or nine prosperous and independent packers who appeared before the Senate committee yesterday protesting against the enactment of the Kendrick and Kenyon bills. Their resolutions, or letter, to the chairman of the committee is as follows:

The undersigned, being beef and pork packers in the city of Baltimore, hereby strongly oppose the two bills known as the Kendrick bill, No. 2202, and the Kenyon bill, No. 2199, introduced in the Senate of the United States on June 23, 1919, for the following reasons:

First. Because the bill states "it is to stimulate the production as well as the distribution of live stock, live-stock products, and for other purposes," which, in our opinion, it can not possibly do.

Second. Because we are opposed to placing the live stock and live-stock products industry in the hands of any one person, being sure that no man living has the ability or capacity to discharge the duties of such a position fairly and without hardship to some packers. And our experience has been that power has been used arbitrarily on many occasions, and this would seriously hamper the proper conduct of the business.

Third. We believe that there are sufficient laws upon the statute books to prevent meat packers from making any unreasonable profits.

Fourth. It is not possible to hamper or reduce the efficiency of the meat packers without injuring the live-stock producers and limiting their output, which in turn decreases the amount of food products for the consumer and increases the price.

Fifth. Because it is a long step toward Government ownership, thereby taking away ambition and initiative.

Sixth. If the packing industry is handicapped, it will be difficult, if not impossible, for the packer to secure sufficient loans at the banks throughout the country during the packing season, when the producer wants a ready market for all of his live stock.

Finally, because of alleged misdoings of the large packers, hundreds of smaller packers who have labored for many years to build up their business this bill injures and tends to destroy.

T. Davis Hill, of Cochran, Hill & Co.; Howard R. Smith, of Jones & Lamb Co.; Joseph Kurdle, of the Thos. J. Kurdle Co.; Fred Shafer, of Jacob C. Shafer Co.; Sol. Greenwald, of Greenwald & Co.; C. F. Kurrie, of Kurrie Packing Co.; W. F. Schludenberg, of the Wm. Schludenberg & Son Co.; C. F. Hohman, of C. Hohman & Sons; H. C. Bertram, of D. B. Martin Co.

Then a number of these gentlemen went on the witness stand and in their testimony declared that the so-called Big Five had not and were not trying to crush them—they had been treated fairly—and opposed this legislation. I wish to call your attention to the testimony of Mr. T. Davis Hill, of Cochran, Hill & Co. (Inc.), beef and pork packers, of Baltimore, Md. This company has just completed a new million-dollar plant and expanded its business. Until a few months ago they were in the pork-packing business, but with their new plant they are slaughtering cattle, sheep, and other animals. Reading from the record of yesterday, we find as follows:

Senator WADSWORTH. Has your business—if you do not mind saying so—been growing the last 10 years?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Senator WADSWORTH. Has it been subject to any undue interferences by any other corporation?

Mr. HILL. Nothing except what competition brings.

Senator WADSWORTH. And you are expanding?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir; very much so.

Mr. Hill further testified that his company went out into the open market and bought their live stock. He said they bought it at Louisville, Indianapolis, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and as far west of Kansas City. Along this line, Senator WADSWORTH asked Mr. Hill this question:

Senator WADSWORTH. Have any of the men who have been buying for you made any complaint to your company that their operations as buyers were hampered in any way in the stockyards?

Mr. HILL. Never; I have not any idea they are.

A little further we read from the record:

Senator WADSWORTH. Has any question arisen in your experience that would lead you to believe the packers control the market?

Mr. HILL. They can not do it.

Senator WADSWORTH. You mean they can not do it?

Mr. HILL. They can not do it.

Senator WADSWORTH. Why not?

Mr. HILL. There are too many small buyers.

Senator WADSWORTH. Too many small buyers?

Mr. HILL. Too many outside packers. You look into the Drovers' Magazine and you will see that outside buyers purchase in Chicago some days more than all the large packers put together. In other words, there are so many orders coming into a market like Chicago some days, for instance, that the smaller packers frequently make the market for the big packers.

Senator WADSWORTH then asked Mr. Hill about his profits. This is also very interesting, Mr. President:

Senator WADSWORTH. How does your margin of profit compare with that of your most powerful competitor, if you can make the comparison?

Mr. HILL. According to their statements, ours was a little better last year. If you will remember, the Government limited the packing industry to 2½ per cent profit on the volume of business. I see by the statements of the large packers that they did not make it.

Senator WADSWORTH. It ran about neck and neck—you did a little better than they did?

Mr. HILL. I believe in 10 years we have done a little better than the larger packers.

So, Mr. President, that would not indicate that the independent packers are existing by sufferance. The testimony yesterday was very interesting, and I want to go a little further:

Senator FRANCE. Mr. Hill, you have built up your business by buying in competition with big packers and in selling in competition with them in the markets?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir.

Senator FRANCE. Can you cite any instance of unfair competition against you?

Mr. HILL. None whatever. Their competition is just the same as we meet all over the country.

Senator FRANCE. Have they never tried to undersell you for the purpose of driving you out of business?

Mr. HILL. I have never seen that disposition. Their competition is exactly the same as we meet everywhere else. There are many branch houses in the business, as you know, and we are in constant competition with smaller and larger packers.

Senator WADSWORTH. How many independent packers are there in Baltimore?

Mr. HILL. Ten or twelve.

Senator WADSWORTH. Ten or twelve small packers?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

As a further evidence of there being competition, in reply to a question by Senator CAPPER, "Is not the market practically the same in respect to the independent packers and 'Big Five' packers; that is, you are not attempting to make a better price than the five big packers at any time?" Mr. Hill says:

As I say, that is not our policy. Our policy is to go out and sell these goods at a profit when we can do it. I venture to say that there is 4 or 5 cents a pound difference between the highest and lowest price on hams in Baltimore to-day.

Mr. President, I understand these other packers from Baltimore testified practically the same things as Mr. Hill. Besides

the Cochran, Hill & Co. expanding, Jones & Lamb, of Baltimore, have, I understand, awarded contracts for \$1,000,000 worth of improvements; that D. B. Martin & Co., another independent packer of Baltimore, is spending \$500,000 on improvements; and that William Schluderberg & Sons have awarded a contract for an addition to their plant costing \$600,000.

Mr. President, does this look like "the lines are drawing in"? All of these gentlemen who testified yesterday, I understand, are among the leading citizens of Baltimore, men of character and standing in their community, and yet we have an agency of the Government giving out reports which are evidently untrue. In addition to the testimony of Mr. Hill, Mr. Howard R. Smith, president of the Jones & Lamb Co., Baltimore, in a statement said:

The impression seems to be abroad with some people that large packers are just simply monopolizing everything and driving the smaller packer out of business. I want to say that we have been in the packing business for 15 years, and we have large and smaller packers as competitors. They have not put us out of business. We have grown right along; in fact, we are now erecting a new plant at Baltimore.

As I have said, Mr. President, this company is building a million-dollar plant.

Mr. Sol. Greenwald, president of the Greenwald Packing Co., Baltimore, when asked if the big packers interfered with them in any way in their business, said: "No, sir; not at all." Mr. Greenwald told the committee that they went into other markets in Kansas City and Chicago, went into competition in stockyards of these places, and bought their live stock. He also denied that the big packers controlled competition. He said the yards were open to anyone.

On July 11, 1919, in a summary, the Federal Trade Commission in its report said:

The packers are also important factors in condensed milk, and are rapidly increasing their proportion. Wisconsin is covered by their creameries, condenseries, and buying stations, and a similar process and control is already evident in the other principal dairy States.

Now, let us see about that statement. Yesterday Mr. William T. Nardin, vice president of the Helvetia Milk Condensing Co., whom I know very well, appeared before the Agriculture Committee of the Senate, and when asked what percentage of the milk business was controlled by the packers, replied:

There was last year produced in the United States about 33,000,000 cases condensed and evaporated milk. \* \* \* The packers produced of that, I should say, not more than 3,000,000 cases.

This, you realize, is not 10 per cent of the milk business of the country.

Chairman GRONNA asked Mr. Nardin this question:

THE CHAIRMAN. How do you find them as competitors? It has been complained, of course, that they are unfair and that when they begin to operate in a new industry they will make prices lower to make it impossible for people with smaller capital to carry on the business and make a profit.

Mr. NARDIN. Speaking for my own company, the company with which I am connected, we have found no difficulty in packer competition in the milk business.

So here we have the testimony of one of the leading milk manufacturers of the country saying the packers controlled less than 10 per cent of the milk business and that they are not unfair in competition.

I desire to call your attention, Mr. President, to another phase of the Federal Trade Commission's report. That is the retail business. Yesterday Mr. Emanuel Wasserman, of Louis Wasserman & Sons, retailers and jobbers of fresh and smoked meats, of Norfolk, Va., gave testimony before the Senate committee against the Kenyon bill. Here is a portion of his testimony. Mr. Wasserman said:

My firm is 47 years old. We handled fresh meats before the packers came into Norfolk and since the packers came into Norfolk. And I want to say that I have personally had 26 years of experience, and all of the dealings I have ever had with the packers themselves they have been absolutely fair and square, and I have prospered since I have dealt with them.

Mr. Wasserman told the committee that before the packers went to Norfolk the butchers got their cattle the best way they could; that the meats were inferior in quality; but since the packers went to Norfolk he said that "meat was delivered to us in better condition; the quality was much better than we could get around home in the country."

Chairman GRONNA asked the witness this question:

Your experience with the packers, then, leads you to believe that the packers are not taking undue advantage of their customers or of the public?

Mr. WASSERMAN. I have had no trouble in any shape or form. I have always been able to buy from them. I have bought also from independent concerns, but I have usually been able to do better buying from the packers. There are two independent concerns in Baltimore that I deal with, and very often I can buy a great deal cheaper right at home from the packers, and save their freight charge, than I can from these independent people.

So, Mr. President, here we have testimony from the independent packers, who are prospering, expanding, defending the

"Big Five" from charges made by the Federal Trade Commission, and who are against this bill.

I wish to say that I have some letters which I shall place in the RECORD, without reading, from many other small, independent packers of the country.

SIoux CITY, IOWA, August 15, 1919.

Hon. BERT M. FERNALD,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed please find printed copies of resolutions passed by the Sioux City Live Stock Exchange on August 8, opposing the Kenyon bill, which we feel is most detrimental not only to the farmer and producer but also to the entire live-stock industry.

We trust you will give these resolutions your careful consideration as the Live Stock Exchange is thoroughly familiar with all phases of the live-stock industry and speaks from actual knowledge.

Respectfully, yours,

PAUL H. CALDWELL,  
Secretary Sioux City Live Stock Exchange.

OPPOSED TO THE KENYON BILL—SIoux CITY LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE SETS FORTH REASONS FOR LACK OF FAITH IN PROPOSED LEGISLATION.

At a meeting of the Sioux City Live Stock Exchange, held yesterday afternoon, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States a bill, Senate file No. 2202, introduced by Senator KENYON, of Iowa; and  
"Whereas said bill proposes to delegate autocratic power to an appointee of the Secretary of Agriculture in that it provides that the person so appointed under the provisions of this act shall have sole control, direction, and supervision of the entire live stock, meat foods, and dairy business of the United States, subject only to the Secretary of Agriculture, in whom is vested power to make any such rules, regulations, or restrictions as he may see fit to impose upon those engaged in any of the varied branches of these industries; and

"Whereas the Sioux City Live Stock Exchange was organized for the purpose of protecting and promoting the interests of the live-stock producer and shipper and has ever been quick to oppose any proposed legislation detrimental to such interests; and

"Whereas it is proposed that live-stock commission firms in the conduct of their business shall be compelled by said bill to conduct their businesses only according to the direction of a political appointee, who may or may not have the interests of the live-stock producer at heart; and

"Whereas after a careful study of this bill and having had the benefit of observation of administration of the rail, telegraph, and telephone lines of our country by bureaus and political appointees, we believe that the passage of such a law would throw the live-stock industry of our country into a state of demoralization beyond all precedent in history; and

"Whereas we believe that any such legislation would delegate to an individual autocratic power, that such control if extended to the live-stock industry would soon be demanded for other branches of industry in our country, and that such control would result in equal demoralization in other lines of commerce; and

"Whereas we contend we have a constitutional right to advise our national legislators of our approval of and our opposition to any law, legislation, or regulation which it is proposed to enforce; and

"Whereas we do not accept dictation or direction from any person, corporation, or organization as to our acts in such matters: Be it now

"Resolved by the Sioux City Live Stock Exchange, organized for the purpose of protection to the interest of patrons of the public markets of the United States, That we do now register our most emphatic protest against the passage of the Kenyon bill or any bill of a similar nature; that we propose at all times and in all places to voice our opposition to such measures, believing them to be undemocratic, unfair, discriminatory, and confiscatory, and request our representatives in Congress to vigorously oppose any such measure; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of this exchange is instructed to forward at once to our representatives in both branches of the Congress of the United States and to representatives in Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Minnesota a certified copy of this preamble and resolution."

AUBURN, ME., July 30, 1919.

To the Hon. BERT M. FERNALD,  
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned slaughterers and meat packers of Lewiston and Auburn, desire to put ourselves on record with you as being strongly opposed to the enactment of such legislation as is proposed in the Kenyon bill (S. 2202), the Kendrick bill (S. 2199), or bills similar thereto.

This is by far the largest slaughtering and packing center in the State of Maine. We handle Maine live stock practically exclusively. We sell our meat food products almost wholly to the State of Maine consumers. Our several businesses are solely owned by ourselves; hence are absolutely independent of any of the larger interests in the same line of business. Yet we honestly believe that such legislation as is above referred to is extremely prejudicial to the best interests of Maine live-stock producers, Maine consumers, and ourselves. Therefore, we hereby and over our signatures hereto most seriously and earnestly implore you to do everything possible to prevent the passage of such bills as are hereinbefore mentioned.

Very sincerely, yours,

E. W. PENLEY,  
J. P. SUTTON Co.  
THE MERRON PACKING Co.  
MARTIN HAAS,  
LITTLEFIELD & SONS Co.

We have testimony from a milk manufacturer, and also from a retailer, denying in each case that the packers are unfair in competition.

Some time ago the Chamber of Commerce of the United States appointed a committee of nine leading citizens without political, industrial, or personal bias, who followed closely the Federal Trade Commission's work for three years. It presented its findings a few months ago with annotated evidence from the commission's own formal statement. The report of this committee



of nine citizens is set forth in seven specific specifications and printed in *The Nation's Business*, the official magazine of the chamber of commerce. These specifications are as follows:

First. The commission has undertaken the exercise of function beyond its own jurisdiction to the detriment of its proper usefulness.

Second. The commission has begun the study of important situations, but because of vacillating interests or for other reasons not apparent has left its work incomplete.

Third. The commission's procedure, originally orderly and appropriate, has changed without public notice or notice to Congress.

Fourth. The commission has abused its powers of publicity. Fifth. Prominent features of the commission's recent food investigations were subversive of common justice.

Sixth. In presenting information to Congress and the public the commission has been heedless of the accuracy and frankness which its position and the circumstances required.

Seventh. The commission has departed from the fundamental purpose for which it was established.

With reference to specification 5, which has to do with the Federal Trade Commission's investigation of the packers, I want to submit as a part of my remarks the full report made by the committee from the Chamber of Commerce:

**PROMINENT FEATURES OF THE COMMISSION'S RECENT FOOD INVESTIGATION WERE SUBVERSIVE OF COMMON JUSTICE.**

On February 7, 1917, the President informed the commission it was "of the highest public concern to ascertain the truth or falsity" of allegations that "the course of trade in important food products is not free, but is restricted and controlled by artificial means," and directed the commission to investigate. Hiring a special counsel at a rate of \$30,000 a year and expenses, although it had stated to a committee of Congress the salary would be at the rate of \$5,000, it proceeded not in the spirit of the President's letter but with the apparent purpose of creating in advance a public impression that the allegations were true. It selected documents already in its possession and had them presented to it at public sessions by its special counsel, refusing to permit concerns that were mentioned in the documents to offer any testimony or produce other documents. It held public sessions at Boston, Philadelphia, St. Paul, and other cities, examined witnesses of its own choosing, and prevented cross-examination by the concerns at which it was made clear the proceedings were directed. At each city the special counsel or other members of the staff let it be known that the Government contemplated taking over and operating the industry. This strange spectacle ended at Chicago in February, 1918, when application was made on behalf of the commission for a search warrant under a section of the espionage act, and the circuit court of appeals quashed the warrant. The result of the commission's course was not to give information to the public, but to place the commission in the position of seeking to create prejudice which would support an apparently preconceived purpose to inaugurate Government operation of the business. In other words, before completing the investigation which the President directed, the commission appeared in the guise of attempting to force adoption of a legislative policy in a matter as to which it had not reported the facts. Another result was to prevent such a determination as the President requested and which he declared was of the highest public concern.

The seriousness of the consequences of the commission's course is apparent from the circumstance that the commission's representative took oath that crimes had been committed. If there was crime on the part of any person, the public welfare demands its immediate prosecution by the properly constituted authorities. It equally demands that the commission, which has no criminal jurisdiction, should sedulously refrain from alleging the perpetration of felonies which have not been proved in accordance with established legal procedure.

Although the commission stated in February, 1917, that its report of this investigation would be completed and published within eight months, and the services of its special counsel terminated on March 31, 1918, so much as a summary of a report regarding meat-packing, which the commission said would be the first food industry it would investigate, was not published until August 8 of this year. This summary of 47 pages the commission states is to be followed by seven reports in support of its conclusions and recommendations. In other words, the commission follows a method of publicity which causes its allegations to obtain wide circulation without opportunity for the public to know the grounds on which these allegations are made. Regarding the facts of the industry in question this committee, of course, is without information. It is in no sense in a position to express an opinion as to the merits of the commission's charges.

So here we have the judgment of a committee of the largest business organizations in the United States upon the character and efficiency of the Federal Trade Commission.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the personnel of the Federal Trade Commission. As I said a few moments ago, the commission was established with the idea of assisting the business interests of our country. But who compose the present commission? Is there a business man of recognized standing on it? I do not want to appear to discredit the Interstate Commerce Commission, for it has been helpful and has rendered excellent service in some instances. But have you ever stopped to think of the class of men who have controlled the policy of the Interstate Commerce Commission? In all these years of its existence it has been controlled mostly by lawyers, men of one profession. Very seldom has there been on the commission a business man, a manufacturer, a farmer, a shipper, or a railroad man trained in the business, except one. I believe there is one railroad man on the commission now, namely, Mr. Clark, who makes a good commissioner. Outside of Mr. Clark the pres-

ent commission is made up of lawyers and teachers. If we are going to have a commission of this sort, I submit it is only fair to business that men who have some knowledge of the things with which these commissions deal should be represented on the commission. Many times the Interstate Commerce Commission has harassed and interfered with railroad management and development. This has been shown, I think, to the satisfaction of everyone since the war and after Government operation of the railroads.

And now, Mr. President, I come to the important question before the Senate, the Kenyon, Kendrick, and Moses bills, which I desire briefly to discuss.

First of all, and I think the most important feature of these bills, is the licensing provision. All packing companies, stockyard companies, commission firms, and dealers in poultry and dairy products must take out a license and submit to regulations by the Secretary of Agriculture through a commissioner of foodstuffs. The Kenyon bill also includes those companies that gather market information and publish price quotations.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Would the Senator be willing to interpret that last sentence?

Mr. FERNALD. I am just coming to what the Senator has in mind, I think.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does it include every publication in the United States?

Mr. FERNALD. I so understand.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Practically every newspaper prints market reports.

Mr. FERNALD. I think so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then, all must take out Government licenses?

Mr. FERNALD. I think so.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine asked not to be interrupted, but I feel that the statement made by the Senator from New York should not go unchallenged. The bill does nothing of the kind. The words used in the bill are "in connections with the stockyards," and such papers are the only ones to be affected.

Mr. FERNALD. But reports in the newspapers would be in connection with the stockyards.

Mr. KENYON. Certainly not. The language relates to stockyard papers and stockyard reports that are issued. There is no attempt, of course, to regulate what should be published in the newspapers, and the language can not be distorted to mean any such thing.

Mr. FERNALD. I think there might be some question as to the interpretation of the language.

Mr. KENYON. If there is, I will say very frankly there is no such intention; but, of course, I realize that those who are opposing the legislation can draw any kind of inference from the language that suits their biased minds.

Mr. FERNALD. I think the Senator knows that I would not undertake to be unfair in the matter.

Mr. KENYON. I understand that, and that is why I think the Senator has not sufficiently studied that provision of the bill.

Mr. FERNALD. The Kenyon bill also makes an exception of concerns engaged in the manufacture and preparation of poultry and dairy products who do a business of less than \$500,000 a year.

The license-provision gives the Secretary of Agriculture power to suspend or revoke licenses. The Kenyon bill provides for the appointment of a receiver to run a business, or to close up its affairs in the case of revocation.

The Kenyon bill specifically gives the Secretary of Agriculture power to decide what products in addition to meats the packers may or may not handle.

These bills provide that the packers must get rid of their interest in stockyards.

The railroads must provide refrigerator cars, thus depriving the packers of their present equipment.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation opens up the whole question of Government regulation of private business. It is the opening wedge for the regulation and licensing of every business in this country. If the Federal Trade Commission has been quoted correctly, it plans to recommend and try to enforce a licensing system on all corporations. In the Washington Post of Friday, August 1, there appeared a news story, from which I take the following:

As a remedy the Federal Trade Commission generally is understood to favor a licensing system for a corporation doing an interstate business, the system to be applied first in those cases where the mulcting of the public has been most flagrant.

So here we have a Government body which is supposed to be helpful to business committed to a licensing system. This is socialistic. It is un-American, and means a blow to American initiative and to American genius.

I am opposed to this whole proposition; and there is no more reason, except for prejudice and misunderstanding, why the packing industry should be singled out for such legislation than the oil business, or the steel business, or any other interstate business. Once this principle is established with the packing industry and with butter and egg dealers, as provided in this bill, there is no reason at all why the same principle should not be extended so as to take in wholesale grocers and other classes of dealers. Because if it is big business and development that is to be under control of the Government certainly the wholesale grocers, some of whom have as many as four hundred retail stores under their control and continuously growing, would fall under the class of big business which needs to be told what it should do. But I am irrevocably opposed to the principle for any business.

Government interference will undoubtedly reduce the efficiency of the present organization of the packers, and thereby increase their expenses, and make them less able to take care of their business at the lowest possible operating cost and at the narrowest possible margin of profit.

The packing business is really a delicate mechanism. Expert skill and judgment are necessary at every step, from the purchase of live animals in the stockyard to the delivery of meat in prime condition to retailers hundreds of miles away. Even with the most expert skill available, and with constant attention to details, the whole complex process is accomplished at only a fraction of a cent a pound for products sold. The least derangement of this machinery on the part of inexperienced Government officials, whose appointment probably would be the result of political consideration, would without question have a serious effect not only on the packers themselves but on producers of live stock and consumers of meat.

The supply of live stock at the large markets varies from day to day and week to week, and can not be controlled by anyone, while in other lines of business most manufacturers can order such quantities of raw materials as they desire and have them delivered at convenient dates. But this is impossible in the packing industry, as live stock comes to market in a constant but unsteady stream. Manufacturers in other lines are in position to set a price for their products, and also regulate the purchase of material and the output of goods in accordance with the quantity that can be sold at the set price. But the packer is unable to control the demand for meats or the supply of live stock; nor has he anything to say about the production of live stock. Another point I wish to make is that the products of most all of the manufacturers are non-perishable and can be held over for an indefinite period. But the packer not only deals with live animals, but his manufactured products are very perishable, and he is compelled to sell the meat before it deteriorates, regardless of price. So he has two sets of fluctuating prices to contend with, those of live stock and those of dressed meat. One of the packer's most serious problems is to know market conditions so thoroughly that he can buy live stock and sell meats a week or two later in such a way as to average his quarter of a cent net profit, notwithstanding the fluctuations in prices of both factors.

Another thing, price fluctuations represent a high degree of competition. Take, for example, the markets for other commodities. Where competition is continuous and severe, as in an organized wheat market, the price oscillates continuously, but only an eighth of a cent at a time. In the potato market, which is not so highly organized and where competition is not so keen, the price remains about the same for days at a time, and jumps or falls a few cents a bushel. Steel rails, as you all remember, remained for years at \$28 a ton. As a general rule, therefore, the less severe the competition the less frequent the fluctuation in price.

Recent experience with the railroads ought to be a sufficient object lesson to keep the Government from trying to interfere with the packing business. The railroad business is performed practically on constant rates. No bargaining ability and no expert judgment of day-to-day commercial conditions is necessary. The packing business deals with highly perishable products that fluctuate in value from day to day, and in which the purchase and sale require the highest degree of business sense and judgment. Interference with such a splendid machine would be much more disastrous than similar interference with the railroads.

The powers of control given under the license provision are too sweeping and too vague. Licensees are prohibited from doing certain specific things, such as to engage in unfair or discriminatory practices, or to sell to each other with a purpose of influencing prices, or to participate in the purchase or sale of commodities so as to substantially lessen competition, or to conspire or to combine or agree in any other way to

suppress competition. The Secretary of Agriculture is given power to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and there is grave danger, Mr. President, because of the vague character of the bill, that the Secretary of Agriculture may be able to say when and in what quantity the packers shall buy live stock, how long they may hold goods before offered for sale, etc. The bill gives specific power to control prices of poultry and various products, and there is a question whether this power may not even be exercised in regard to meat products.

Mr. President, to give an official of the Government any such powers over private business, and especially to have the bill so worded that it is impossible to tell how far such an official may go, is unthinkable in this country.

Power to suspend or revoke a license is in itself too drastic, and even the right of appeal to the courts is restricted. The power to suspend or revoke a license might well be used as a club to force licensees to submit to unfair and discriminatory regulations. The Kenyon bill says that the circuit court of appeals may not modify or set aside an order of the Secretary of Agriculture to suspend or revoke a license unless it can be shown that the order was unsupported by evidence, or was issued without due notice and reasonable opportunity to the licensee for a hearing, or infringes the Constitution, or is beyond the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. In other words, right of appeal is so restricted that the circuit court of appeals is restrained from viewing the facts in the case if it can be shown that the Secretary of Agriculture gave a fair hearing and collected evidence. The appeal to the Supreme Court can be made only on a writ of certiorari, which the Supreme Court can grant or not, as it sees fit.

Senators, I submit this proposed legislation is unnecessary. There are ample laws on our statute books already to prevent any combination in restraint of trade and any unfair methods. But is there any combination or monopoly among the packers? Each of these Big Five packers affirmed before the Senate committee last winter that there was no form of agreement with other packers or among themselves to affect the price of live stock or meats. The Federal Trade Commission failed to get any evidence of combination in its report. It is only by unfair methods, by misinterpretation and misstatement of facts, that it is able to come to the conclusion that there is combination in restraint of trade.

There is proof in plenty of actual competition, as shown by the evidence submitted at the hearings last winter. The live stock is bought in the open market, where there are hundreds of buyers representing big and little packers, butchers, feeders, and speculators. The shipment of live stock from one market to another by speculators, thus keeping the markets in line with each other and making it impossible to manipulate the price, even if an attempt were made to do so; the fact that packers' profits are so small and vary from week to week, often becoming losses; the fact that fresh meat is perishable and has to be sold within a few days for what it will bring; the fact that the different packers have branch houses in the same city and solicit trade from the retailers; the fact that retail butchers shop around from the branch house of one packer to the branch house of the other, finding differences in prices and buying where prices are most favorable—these and many other things are unmistakable proofs of competition to the man who actually gets out in the market and who studies conditions first hand.

If there is any unfair competition or monopoly or any practices in trading that are not on the square, the Clayton antitrust law and the Federal Trade Commission law give ample power to suppress such illegal operations. It is significant, Mr. President, that the Federal Trade Commission has discovered no such practices, in spite of its combing of the country for prejudiced witnesses and dissatisfied competitors and customers of the packing industry.

Another complaint against the packers is made by the wholesale grocers. Let me say that there are more wholesale grocers in the country who are doing a packing business than there are packers who are in the grocery business. I am quite as well acquainted with the wholesale grocers of the country as I am with the packers. They are my customers and friends, and if I had any prejudice at all it would naturally be in their favor. They complain that the packers have gone far afield in the handling of other perishable products and products handled by the grocers themselves. This, I believe, is entirely unfounded.

I believe that by selling other products the packers have been a real benefit to the country. I believe that their reason for handling the other products is sound. I understand, however, that they handle such small quantities of these products that there is no ground for the complaint that they are getting control of the food supply of the Nation. The same argument made



by the wholesale grocers could be used against them for handling drugs, hardware, automobile supplies, and many other goods entirely out of their line.

The packers explain that they have engaged in the produce business for the reason that they can utilize their magnificent selling organization, including refrigerator cars, branch houses, and salesmen, to better advantage, thereby decreasing unit selling costs both for meat, poultry, eggs, and butter. This argument sounds plausible, and I can not see why it has not been a good thing for the country.

Mr. President, to me it is unthinkable that Congress should give the Government power to say what products a concern may or may not handle. If this principle is established for the packers, it might as well be established for a mail-order business or a department store, which handles nearly everything. Are we going to put a limit in this country upon a man's endeavor? Are we going to say to the manufacturer, or the merchant, or the banker, or to any other kind of business in this country, "You can only do so much business; you may engage in only certain kinds of business; and when you have accomplished certain things you must stop"? That, Mr. President, is what this proposed legislation will bring about.

These bills before the Senate would take away from the packers their refrigerator cars, which would mean poorer service and higher costs. The very reason packers own their refrigerator cars is because the railroads refused to furnish this equipment. If they had not built their own cars they would not have been able to develop their own business, and neither would the country at large have been served so well with fresh meat and other foods. Through long years of experience they have developed a transportation department that routes the cars and watches their movements, sees that they lose no time in transit, and keeps them clean and properly repaired. As a result the packers' cars cover more miles in a year than any other class of freight cars.

The Interstate Commerce Commission made an exhaustive study of private car lines, and in its report of July 31, 1918, came to the following conclusion, which seems to bear out the packers' argument—

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. FERNALD. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but in connection with the packing business I think it is necessary to discuss not only the meat products but all the by-products. I am just saying this to get the Senator's view. It is charged, of course, that the packers handle some 562 other products besides meat. It is also charged that the packers control certain by-products, such as hides, for instance. I think the Federal Trade Commission has submitted a report which shows that the Big Five packers really control the hide industry. I am simply stating that the report shows that. I think the last report made by the Federal Trade Commission—which I had not read and did not know what it contained until the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] called my attention to it to-day—shows that these Big Five packers really control the meat industry in a large percentage—between 70 and 80 per cent.

Mr. FERNALD. Excuse me; I think the Senator was out when I took up that matter. I showed just what per cent they did control. I think the Senator from North Dakota was absent at the time.

Mr. GRONNA. I am just coming to that. I heard the Senator's statement. I had an idea that they controlled only 40 per cent, but I think the 40 per cent has reference to all the meat—meat slaughtered on farms and in local butcher shops, and all that.

Mr. FERNALD. The inspected meat.

Mr. GRONNA. That is the question I should like to ask the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of confusion about that. Is not this the situation: As to the meat that goes into commerce, they control about 73 per cent and a fraction. Taking all the meat in the country, killed on the farm, in local butcher shops, and so forth, the figures are those that the Senator gave—some forty-odd per cent. I think that is the difference.

Mr. GRONNA. That may be.

Mr. FERNALD. I should like to finish the discussion of this car business, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. GRONNA. There was just one other question, if the Senator will yield further. I was very much confused about two things.

Mr. FERNALD. I should like to answer the question which the Senator has just suggested in regard to the control of the grocery business.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. FERNALD. I assume that the complaint of the wholesale grocers, if they have any complaint, is for the reason that the packers are underselling them. Certainly if the packers asked more for their goods than the wholesale grocers, they would not have any serious competition. The very thing we are trying to do by this proposed legislation, as I understand, is to lower the high cost of living. If that can be done without the middlemen that we hear so much about, and if it is true that the packer can produce his goods and deliver them to the consumer at a lower price than the wholesale grocer, I can not see why the Congress of the United States or the consumers should find any fault with the packers. I think that answers that question.

Mr. GRONNA. That partly answers it; but I think the wholesale grocers also charge discrimination. The big packers, of course, have refrigerator cars. They get out what they call these peddler cars.

Mr. FERNALD. They have their cars because that is the only way in which they can ship their goods. The railroad companies failed to furnish cars, and in order that they might have them they had to build them themselves.

Mr. GRONNA. I am very sorry that I am taking up so much of the time of the Senator, but there is another question I should like to ask.

Mr. FERNALD. Go on, Senator; I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. In fact, I did not quite complete the first question. The large packers and the small packers all agree that they made more profit during the control by the Federal Government than they had ever made.

Mr. FERNALD. Does not that apply to everybody?

Mr. GRONNA. I ask the question then, "Why do you oppose Government control?"

Mr. FERNALD. For the same reason that the Senator would not like to have this Government control the wheat situation.

Mr. GRONNA. I was about to state that that question was answered in a way that satisfied me that it was because of the fear which the business entertained.

Mr. FERNALD. Exactly.

Mr. GRONNA. But there is another question which I think is fundamental, and that is this: "We say that the Big Five packers have reached the very apex of efficiency, but in the face of that it is admitted by the small packers that the Big Five are not driving them out of business. They are permitted to make not only reasonable but large profits. That is a matter, I think, which has never been explained. I know the Senator is well informed, and I wish he would explain it."

Mr. FERNALD. I think that the small packer, the man who can efficiently and economically manage his own business a little better than another man, will always succeed. We have near by this city, in Baltimore, some of the most enterprising packing concerns in this country, all of them prosperous. There is always a great demand for foodstuffs; and the packing business is a little different from anything else, because the population of the country is continually increasing and making a demand for the packers' products, and I am frank to say that in the past few years there has not been enough encouragement to the packers so that there have been many new establishments. As I said a little while ago, we ought to have building in this country to-day more than 100 large canneries, and yet there have been very few built in the last five years.

Now, I am on this private-car business, Senator.

This is from the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission and is found on page 763 of their report:

The system of the use and supply of private cars that now exists can not be at once and radically changed without serious consequences to shippers, carriers, and the public.

On page 683 the Interstate Commerce Commission says:

As a rule, carriers have never furnished these cars, and it has come to be mutually understood that they should not do so. The oil refiner and meat packer demand an adequate supply of cars at all times. It is conceded by shippers that neither an adequate supply nor an efficient distribution can be afforded by carriers. The requirements have been that there shall be the most efficient use of tank and refrigerator cars, which has been one of the results of private ownership. While this has undoubtedly been of benefit to carriers, it has been of incalculable benefit to shippers as well.

Again on page 691 the Interstate Commerce Commission also reports:

These great shippers of perishable articles have been used to the fullest extent of their splendidly effective organizations to secure prompt service for their cars used in shipments of their products.

There are too few meat refrigerator cars now in the United States, and it is only with the most careful following up of

their cars that the packers make them serve their purpose. If the railroads were required to furnish all the cars it would be necessary to have many more cars than are now in operation, because the railroads could not handle them as efficiently and expeditiously as do the transportation departments of the packers. It would also be a tremendous expense to the railroads, who have already been starved by Government restrictions for the past 10 years, and who are not in a position to undertake this additional expense. Nothing could be gained by taking the refrigerator cars away from the packers and extending their use. The reason that the proponents of this legislation want the cars taken from the packers is that they feel that many smaller shippers need more cars than they can get at present. If this is the case the logical remedy is to require the railroads to furnish enough cars to satisfy smaller shippers who can not afford to own them, rather than to cripple the service of the large packers and the country generally by doing away with the present splendid organization.

The proposed bills would force the packers to sell their interests in stockyards on the theory that their ownership gives them power over prices and also the control of the market. The packers, at the hearings before the Senate committee, vigorously denied this charge, and declared that the markets are free and open to all buyers of live stock, and that their ownership in the stockyards has no control over prices or in trading whatsoever.

The packers assert that they became interested in the stockyards principally to insure adequate facilities for taking care of live animals and for rendering proper service. If we are to believe these gentlemen, their ownership has nothing to do with the control over prices and if in other hands would probably mean poorer facilities and poorer service, and this would react to the detriment of the live-stock shippers as much, if not more, than to the packers.

But I believe, in their testimony before the Senate committee, they declare they were willing to surrender their interests in the stockyards if they were compensated for their investments.

So, Mr. President, I am unalterably opposed to these bills. I am not personally interested in any of the so-called big packers. I do not know a single one of them. But I am greatly interested in and deeply concerned about the success and welfare of American business men. I am a business man myself, and I know how the business men of the country feel about this sort of legislation.

Mr. President, I wonder sometimes where we are drifting. We are living in an uncertain age. Conditions have changed. The World War has turned things upside down. Some good-meaning gentlemen would steer our good old ship out into new channels and run us into new harbors—or maybe upon the rocks. I sometimes think our whole civilization is in danger, a civilization that has required ages to build and at a great sacrifice. In these days of uncertainty and unrest we hear new and strange voices—voices which speak a language foreign to American traditions and American teachings. If there ever was a time in the history of this Republic when we should stand firmly and squarely upon our feet, that time is now. Let us not be led away into new fields and untrodden paths, but let us hold fast to those things that have made us the great Nation we are to-day. Let business alone. Why heckle and harass it? History will show, Mr. President, that in all past trials of this country our business men have stood like a rock for their country. It has been so in the past, and I venture to say that the business men of to-day will be the last to embrace these strange theories of government that we hear discussed. The American business man is the bulwark of our institutions, and if this country escapes the hysteria, the new innovations, that some would throw upon us, it will be through the calm common sense of the American business man. If the torch of commerce is to be lighted again in this country of ours and to shine on as in the past, the guiding light of the nations of the world, it is the hand of the American business man that must hold it aloft.

So, Mr. President, in behalf of the business men of this country, in behalf of those who have had as much to do in making our country great as any other class of citizens, I want to protest here and now against this proposed legislation. It is filled with danger to our institutions and our system of government. It is socialistic, it is un-American, and should be defeated.

The stifling, throttling legislation which has been applied to the railroads has stamped out all the initiative and ambition of railroad men. But if we again enact laws of reasonable fairness and justice to the railroad systems of the country there will be new development and greater progress, and we shall achieve a transportation system adequate to mobilize the economic resources of our Nation in a manner to excite the admiration and the wonder of mankind.

And in similar manner, if those men who are constantly pointing to the owners of the big business enterprises and criticizing oftentimes the men and motives rather than the methods will desist from attempting to dictate to the big industries of the country, again the opportunity will present itself to our young business men of ambition and initiative and genius. Remove the shackles that some men are attempting to place upon the business interests of this country. Give them a fair field. Open the avenues of commerce, stimulate trade. Let each in his way work out the great industrial problems before us.

Then will follow, in my judgment, a peace and prosperity to our Government such as the world has never known. And instead of attempting to make big business little, let us all pull together to make little business big. Where industry creates and justice protects, prosperity dwells.

#### HIGH COST OF LIVING.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] introduced some figures on the question of the high cost of living. In reply thereto I wish to introduce a statement of the Bureau of Markets, Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HALE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
BUREAU OF MARKETS,  
WASHINGTON, D. C., August 18, 1919.

#### Storage report for Aug. 1, 1919.

Commodity.	Reported for Aug. 1, 1919.		Estimated holdings—storages not reporting.		Total holdings Aug. 1, 1919.
	Storages.	Quantity.	Storages.	Quantity.	
Butter:					
Creamery.....	334	122,771,843	22	2,067,949	124,839,792
Packing stock.....	133	2,925,189	4	7,785	2,932,975
Cheese:					
American.....	420	61,998,676	29	481,486	62,480,162
Swiss, including block.....	109	2,008,262	4	2,309	2,010,571
Brick and Munster.....	152	816,852	10	20,766	837,618
Limburger.....	106	828,268	9	4,231	832,499
Cottage, pot and bakers'.....	74	6,863,122	1	2,670	6,865,792
Cream and Neufchatel.....	28	249,614	1	59,604	309,218
All other.....	78	3,470,706	3	19,053	3,489,759
Eggs:					
Case.....	392	7,784,452	28	68,836	7,853,288
Frozen.....	191	18,979,788	6	26,919	19,006,707
Frozen poultry:					
Broilers.....	178	6,073,802	6	85,352	6,159,154
Roasters.....	171	7,234,762	4	15,757	7,250,519
Fowls.....	188	7,089,488	8	347,590	7,437,078
Turkeys.....	192	4,349,343	6	44,003	4,393,346
Miscellaneous.....	236	15,333,541	11	101,764	15,435,305
Meat products:					
Frozen beef.....	324	158,967,326	16	721,099	159,688,425
Frozen pork.....	327	132,310,040	14	2,385,548	134,695,588
Frozen lamb and mutton.....	204	7,157,205	11	144,115	7,301,320
Cured beef.....	330	30,343,883	17	577,339	30,921,213
Dry salt pork.....	447	363,761,024	21	2,366,483	366,127,507
Pickled pork.....	515	376,490,421	21	5,953,221	382,443,642
Lard.....	553	96,719,266	26	2,195,827	98,915,093
Miscellaneous meats.....	368	81,100,842	50	4,795,767	85,896,609

Comparison of holdings of Aug. 1, 1919, with those of other months.  
(Holdings include estimates of stocks of storages not reporting.)

Commodity.	Total holdings Aug. 1, 1919. (pounds)	Increase or decrease, 1918-19.		Total holdings July 1, 1919. (pounds)	Increase or decrease during July, 1919.	
		Pounds.	Per cent.		Pounds.	Per cent.
Butter:						
Creamery.....	88,786,243	+36,053,549	+40.6	90,158,103	+34,681,689	+38.5
Packing stock.....	5,631,900	-2,698,925	-47.9	1,908,473	+1,024,502	+53.7
Cheese:						
American.....	42,456,557	+20,023,605	+47.2	37,501,294	+24,978,868	+66.6
Swiss, including block.....	439,143	+1,571,428	+357.8	1,002,707	+1,007,864	+100.5
Brick and Munster.....	530,927	+306,691	+57.8	879,735	-42,117	-4.8
Limburger.....	438,725	+393,774	+89.8	689,905	+142,594	+20.7
Cottage, pot and bakers'.....	2,402,068	+4,463,724	+185.8	6,601,431	+264,351	+4.0
Cream and Neufchatel.....	220,004	+89,214	+40.6	227,992	+81,226	+35.6
All other.....	3,957,148	-467,389	-11.8	3,304,446	+185,313	+5.6
Eggs:						
Case.....	6,523,942	+1,329,346	+20.4	7,658,841	+194,447	+2.5
Frozen.....	15,166,623	+3,840,084	+25.3	16,471,920	+2,534,787	+15.4



Comparison of holdings of Aug. 1, 1919, with those of other months—Con.

Commodity.	Total holdings Aug. 1, 1918. (pounds).	Increase or decrease, 1918-19.		Total holdings July 1, 1919. (pounds).	Increase or decrease during July, 1919.	
		Pounds.	Per cent.		Pounds.	Per cent.
Frozen poultry:						
Broilers.....	1,598,847	+ 4,560,307	+285.2	7,409,029	- 1,249,875	- 16.9
Roasters.....	1,463,159	+ 5,787,360	+395.5	10,293,711	- 3,043,192	- 29.6
Fowls.....	5,783,261	+ 1,653,817	+ 28.6	9,571,682	- 2,134,604	- 22.3
Turkeys.....	3,084,166	+ 1,309,180	+ 42.4	5,378,098	- 984,752	- 18.3
Miscellaneous.....	6,414,822	+ 9,020,483	+140.6	16,559,020	- 1,123,715	- 6.8
Meat products:						
Frozen beef.....	172,321,920	-12,633,495	- 7.3	162,638,789	- 2,950,364	- 1.8
Frozen pork.....	87,034,543	+47,661,045	+ 54.8	155,203,362	-20,567,774	-13.2
Frozen lamb and mutton.....	3,057,498	+ 4,243,627	+138.8	7,278,826	+ 22,494	+ 0.3
Cured beef.....	28,128,221	+ 2,792,992	+ 9.9	229,244,319	+ 1,676,894	+ 5.7
Dry salt pork.....	370,255,601	- 4,128,094	- 1.1	381,736,178	-15,608,671	- 4.1
Pickled pork.....	366,177,387	+16,298,255	+ 4.4	422,387,012	-39,943,370	- 9.5
Lard.....	102,298,512	- 3,839,419	- 3.3	92,131,616	+ 6,788,577	+ 7.4
Miscellaneous meats.....	77,591,505	+ 8,305,104	+ 10.7	89,641,671	- 3,745,062	- 4.2

Storage holdings of Aug. 1, 1919, segregated by sections.

Commodity.	New England.	Middle Atlantic.	South Atlantic.	North, central, east.
Butter:				
Creamery.....	23,923,975	42,673,554	1,951,362	34,820,067
Packing stock.....		242,003	294,679	1,103,031
Cheese:				
American.....	6,057,166	22,488,265	2,979,077	22,323,780
Swiss, including block.....	3,473	706,537	11,672	997,896
Brick and Munster.....	1,164	103,248	1,210	512,482
Limburger.....		163,386		571,347
Cottage, pot and bakers.....	237,804	3,617,259	109,819	2,562,792
Cream and Neufchatel.....	41,983	128,326	933	22,663
All other.....	5,244	1,138,437	2,540	1,973,875
Eggs:				
Case.....	797,510	2,383,613	126,329	2,380,777
Frozen.....	659,523	4,935,184	647,877	6,486,713
Frozen poultry:				
Broilers.....	570,734	1,549,349	92,558	2,709,994
Roasters.....	574,755	3,424,200	171,169	2,368,782
Fowls.....	709,741	1,917,153	296,695	2,866,646
Turkeys.....	831,632	2,234,155	114,159	623,873
Miscellaneous.....	1,131,064	6,855,421	71,566	4,776,173
Meat products:				
Frozen beef.....	7,357,579	61,012,496	1,239,143	74,362,894
Frozen pork.....	22,492,251	19,511,432	2,125,058	39,712,125
Frozen lamb and mutton.....	1,137,389	4,459,136	123,272	644,984
Cured beef.....	2,035,451	11,375,709	570,083	11,792,658
Dry salt pork.....	14,262,441	26,233,821	6,254,881	144,891,869
Pickled pork.....	25,923,155	28,775,600	8,176,215	142,783,504
Lard.....	8,409,861	8,941,909	1,649,532	47,603,226
Miscellaneous meats.....	3,188,190	8,422,372	1,603,426	32,812,065

Commodity.	North, central, west.	South, central.	Western, north.	Western, south.
Butter:				
Creamery.....	9,726,220	1,843,910	3,200,114	4,632,641
Packing stock.....	705,765	240,527	301,446	37,738
Cheese:				
American.....	1,286,518	1,583,534	911,810	4,368,526
Swiss, including block.....	25,941	7,188	18,243	237,342
Brick and Munster.....	64,256	30,713	19,621	93,858
Limburger.....	26,709	2,554	865	63,406
Cottage, pot and bakers.....	206,397	609	57,493	41,039
Cream and Neufchatel.....	27,687	2,904	25,118	
All other.....	205,271	63,429	28,916	52,994
Eggs:				
Case.....	1,289,500	326,855	115,648	364,220
Frozen.....	3,319,947	368,782	2,033,055	528,707
Frozen poultry:				
Broilers.....	281,798	242,618	66,913	559,838
Roasters.....	479,027	38,864	88,244	91,721
Fowls.....	691,050	125,690	153,241	269,272
Turkeys.....	159,713	125,850	17,807	242,648
Miscellaneous.....	1,977,247	153,947	56,486	311,637
Meat products:				
Frozen beef.....	8,453,567	3,071,624	730,816	2,739,207
Frozen pork.....	36,638,701	4,065,052	2,259,810	4,905,611
Frozen lamb and mutton.....	458,246	134,212	16,099	183,897
Cured beef.....	3,181,971	565,323	189,433	633,249
Dry salt pork.....	189,122,276	9,295,516	1,601,546	2,698,674
Pickled pork.....	143,075,275	13,637,968	6,161,462	8,057,242
Lard.....	24,878,301	1,920,517	1,199,533	2,116,387
Miscellaneous meats.....	26,163,924	5,659,357	436,884	2,814,594

NOTE.—All commodities are given in terms of pounds except case eggs, which are given in terms of cases.

Comparison of holdings of Aug. 1, 1918, with those of Aug. 1, 1917.

Commodity.	Storages.	Aug. 1, 1917. (quantity).	Aug. 1, 1918. (quantity).	Increase or decrease (quantity).	Increase or decrease (per cent.).
Butter:					
Creamery.....	380	79,203,492	81,384,643	+ 2,181,151	+ 2.8
Packing stock.....	108	3,446,703	5,409,682	+ 1,962,979	+57.0
Cheese:					
American.....	444	67,595,147	47,752,854	- 19,842,293	-29.4
Swiss, including block.....					
Brick and Munster.....					
Limburger.....					
Cottage, pot, and bakers.....					
Cream and Neufchatel.....					
All other.....					
Eggs:					
Case.....	447	6,838,100	6,486,571	- 351,529	- 5.1
Frozen.....	166	15,384,461	13,458,420	- 1,926,041	-12.5
Frozen poultry:					
Broilers.....	142	4,273,635	505,665	- 3,767,970	-88.2
Roasters.....	140	6,110,333	461,267	- 5,649,066	-92.5
Fowls.....	153	3,481,934	2,092,300	- 1,389,634	-39.9
Turkeys.....	147	4,077,952	815,729	- 3,262,223	-80.0
Miscellaneous.....	187	9,815,927	3,439,804	- 6,376,123	-65.0
Meat products:					
Frozen beef.....	323	108,728,886	182,486,446	+ 73,757,560	+67.8
Frozen pork.....	313	96,648,335	102,889,405	+ 6,241,070	+ 6.5
Frozen lamb and mutton.....	179	3,912,194	3,728,697	- 183,497	- 4.7
Cured beef.....	330	32,401,017	28,773,872	- 3,627,145	-11.2
Dry salt pork.....	437	231,905,289	364,349,447	+132,444,158	+57.1
Pickled pork.....	523	403,704,023	367,987,377	- 35,716,646	- 8.8
Lard.....	543	112,248,614	98,745,935	- 13,502,679	-12.0
Miscellaneous meats.....	137	16,172,614	27,400,750	+ 11,228,136	+69.4

Comparison of holdings of July 1, 1918, with those of Aug. 1, 1918.

Commodity.	Storages.	July 1, 1918. (quantity).	Aug. 1, 1918. (quantity).	Increase or decrease (quantity).	Increase or decrease (per cent.).
Butter:					
Creamery.....	396	48,922,955	87,303,310	+38,380,355	+78.5
Packing stock.....	122	4,699,120	6,626,287	+ 1,927,167	+41.0
Cheese:					
American.....	468	32,449,731	50,771,440	+18,321,709	+56.5
Swiss, including block.....					
Brick and Munster.....					
Limburger.....					
Cottage, pot, and bakers.....					
Cream and Neufchatel.....					
All other.....					
Eggs:					
Case.....	456	6,486,240	6,502,588	+ 16,339	+ .3
Frozen.....	189	12,575,215	14,727,667	+ 2,152,452	+17.1
Frozen poultry:					
Broilers.....	183	1,310,113	1,564,438	+ 254,325	+19.4
Roasters.....	177	2,313,742	1,449,221	- 864,521	-37.4
Fowls.....	200	4,251,035	5,785,774	+ 1,534,739	+36.1
Turkeys.....	193	4,231,769	3,084,071	- 1,147,698	-27.1
Miscellaneous.....	229	5,675,510	6,958,274	+ 1,282,764	+22.6
Meat products:					
Frozen beef.....	249	168,976,288	195,964,246	+26,977,958	+16.0
Frozen pork.....	339	117,327,752	107,321,039	-10,006,713	- 8.5
Frozen lamb and mutton.....	198	3,489,465	4,084,018	+ 594,553	+17.0
Cured beef.....	354	23,507,174	29,381,024	+ 5,873,850	+25.0
Dry salt pork.....	461	394,269,402	367,733,275	-26,536,127	- 6.7
Pickled pork.....	540	376,411,618	373,357,401	- 3,054,217	- .8
Lard.....	581	105,838,972	101,103,267	- 4,735,705	- 4.5
Miscellaneous meats.....					

Report of cold-storage holdings of cheese July 1, 1919.

Varieties.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Estimated holdings, storages not reported.		Reported for June 1, 1919.	
	Storages.	Pounds.	Storages.	Pounds.	Storages.	Pounds.
American.....	435	36,394,631	16	805,021	467	12,477,707
Swiss, including block.....	116	937,075	9	109,957	139	866,882
Brick and Munster.....	161	772,701	11	91,205	183	417,000
Limburger.....	110	605,797	10	20,970	126	418,161
Cottage, pot, bakers.....	73	6,599,127	1	24,210	72	5,294,229
Cream and Neufchatel.....	27	168,375	4	91,472	31	114,189
All other.....	79	3,249,495	4	7,196	94	2,363,000

Comparison of holdings of July 1, 1919, with those of July 1, 1918.  
[Includes totals for all storages reporting for both dates.]

Varieties.	Stor- ages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	July 1, 1919 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (pounds).	Increase or decrease (percent).
American.....	376	24,119,682	30,070,644	+5,950,962	+24.7
Swiss, including block.....	58	205,254	314,158	+108,904	+53.1
Brick and Munster.....	82	416,253	270,091	-146,162	-35.1
Limburger.....	65	233,414	161,082	-72,332	-31.0
Cottage, pot, bakers.....	33	2,116,686	2,898,371	+781,685	+36.9
Cream and Neuchatel.....	13	218,737	85,307	-133,430	-61.0
All other.....	48	1,980,957	1,915,050	-65,907	-3.3

Comparison of holdings of July 1, 1919, with those of June 1, 1919.  
[Includes totals for all storages reporting for both dates.]

Varieties.	Stor- ages.	June 1, 1919 (pounds).	July 1, 1919 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
American.....	411	11,650,148	36,005,410	+24,349,262	+208.9
Swiss, including block.....	110	761,439	898,235	+136,796	+18.0
Brick and Munster.....	152	348,387	768,078	+419,694	+120.5
Limburger.....	106	380,956	604,739	+223,783	+58.7
Cottage, pot, bakers.....	69	5,274,799	6,570,145	+1,295,346	+24.6
Cream and Neuchatel.....	23	112,567	168,215	+55,648	+49.4
All other.....	74	2,357,905	3,247,372	+889,467	+37.7

Comparison of holdings of July 1, 1918, with those of June 1, 1918.  
[Includes totals for all storages reporting for both dates.]

Varieties.	Stor- ages.	June 1, 1918 (pounds).	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
American.....	242	15,239,702	22,135,883	+6,896,181	+45.3
Swiss, including block.....	46	142,563	176,487	+33,924	+23.8
Brick and Munster.....	66	362,854	365,654	+2,790	+0.8
Limburger.....	49	146,658	192,924	+46,266	+31.5
Cottage, pot, bakers.....	21	484,122	1,192,840	+708,718	+146.4
Cream and Neuchatel.....	8	28,566	216,767	+188,201	+658.8
All other.....	35	798,870	819,445	+20,575	+2.6

Cold-storage holdings of cheese on July 1, 1919, with comparisons of the  
holdings July 1, 1919, and July 1, 1918, by sections.

Sections.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of holdings. <sup>1</sup>			
	Stor- ages.	Pounds.	Stor- ages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	July 1, 1919 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
New England.....	15	3,393,306	24	2,680,108	3,303,750	+23.3
Middle Atlantic.....	98	14,314,177	81	6,893,854	11,481,143	+66.5
South Atlantic.....	32	1,151,945	30	872,313	1,149,905	+31.8
North Central (E.).....	92	11,782,429	78	8,878,513	9,241,747	+4.1
North Central (W.).....	71	865,938	58	1,098,073	755,217	-31.2
South Central.....	54	1,231,248	48	1,257,411	1,149,696	-8.6
Western (North).....	22	662,016	19	287,612	607,743	+111.3
Western (South).....	41	2,993,572	38	2,151,798	2,381,443	+10.7
Totals.....	435	36,394,631	376	24,119,682	30,070,644	+24.7

#### SWISS, INCLUDING BLOCK

New England.....	3	3,951	2	2,563	3,951	+54.2
Middle Atlantic.....	23	318,558	13	19,487	134,049	+92.9
South Atlantic.....	4	7,013				
North Central (E.).....	31	437,324	13	80,104	88,571	+10.6
North Central (W.).....	13	18,243	9	3,443	12,006	+248.7
South Central.....	7	9,634	6	6,581	6,054	-8.0
Western (North).....	8	19,290	4	2,872	1,932	-32.0
Western (South).....	17	123,062	11	40,204	67,575	+68.1
Total.....	116	937,075	58	205,254	314,158	+53.1

#### BRICK AND MUNSTER.

New England.....	2	840	1	125	840	+572.0
Middle Atlantic.....	19	63,164	12	18,861	20,011	+6.1
South Atlantic.....	1	145				
North Central (E.).....	24	479,601	25	299,154	114,791	-61.6
North Central (W.).....	40	108,501	24	33,882	81,974	+141.9
South Central.....	13	24,219	7	8,416	12,690	+50.8
Western (North).....	9	20,219	5	15,154	13,484	-11.0
Western (South).....	13	76,012	8	40,661	26,301	-35.3
Total.....	161	772,701	12	416,253	270,091	-35.1

<sup>1</sup> Includes totals for those storages reporting for both dates.

Cold-storage holdings of cheese on July 1, 1919, etc.—Continued.

#### LIMBURGER.

Sections.	Reported for July 1, 1918.		Comparison of holdings. <sup>1</sup>			
	Stor- ages.	Pounds.	Stor- ages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	July 1, 1919 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
New England.....	17	53,633	10	45,979	37,271	-18.9
Middle Atlantic.....	1					
South Atlantic.....	41	492,581	22	143,758	95,411	-33.6
North Central (E.).....	25	11,716	17	8,818	6,967	-20.8
North Central (W.).....	9	5,310	5	1,621	4,109	+153.5
South Central.....	7	6,836	5	8,004	298	-96.3
Western (North).....	10	35,921	6	25,234	17,006	-32.6
Western (South).....						
Total.....	110	605,797	65	233,414	161,082	-31.0

#### COTTAGE, POT, AND BAKERS.

New England.....	3	245,499	1	8,611	13,363	+55.2
Middle Atlantic.....	30	3,449,522	19	1,166,115	1,620,790	+39.0
South Atlantic.....	3	123,763	1	19,800	6,000	-69.7
North Central (E.).....	20	2,456,902	7	855,832	1,232,877	+44.1
North Central (W.).....	10	220,024	3	2,341	395	-88.1
South Central.....	1	818				
Western (N.).....	4	63,542	1		2,670	
Western (S.).....	2	39,057	1	63,467	22,276	-64.9
Total.....	73	6,599,127	33	2,116,686	2,898,371	+36.9

#### CREAM AND NEUCHATEL.

New England.....	2	45,562	1			
Middle Atlantic.....	5	67,316	3	208,858	65,756	-68.5
South Atlantic.....	1	1,408				
North Central (E.).....	8	13,950	4	2,129	6,633	+211.6
North Central (W.).....	7	14,712	4	7,250	12,918	+78.2
South Central.....	2	3,993				
Western (N.).....	2	21,434	1	500		-100.0
Western (S.).....						
Total.....	27	168,375	13	218,737	85,307	-61.0

#### ALL OTHER VARIETIES.

New England.....	2	6,476	1	4,582	4,800	+4.8
Middle Atlantic.....	16	1,114,275	12	1,649,834	1,056,832	-35.9
South Atlantic.....	1	2,540	1	17,009	2,540	+85.1
North Central (E.).....	24	1,865,619	12	189,033	794,238	+320.2
North Central (W.).....	16	117,547	9	1,718	9,516	+453.9
South Central.....	7	44,614	7	118,580	44,614	-62.4
Western (N.).....	4	18,736	2		1,594	
Western (S.).....	9	79,688	4	210	916	+336.2
Total.....	79	3,249,495	48	1,980,957	1,915,050	-3.3

<sup>1</sup> Includes totals for those storages reporting for both dates.

New England: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.  
Middle Atlantic: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.  
South Atlantic: Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida.  
North Central (east of Mississippi River): Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin; (west of Mississippi River), Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas.  
South Central: Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Arkansas.  
Western (north): Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, Oregon; (south), Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, California.  
A summary of this report was released by wire on July 14, 1919. Upon request any or all of the information contained in these reports will be telegraphed immediately upon its release. The reports are free, except for the telegrams, which are sent charges collect.

Report of cold-storage holdings of butter and eggs, July 1, 1919.

Commodity.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Estimated hold- ings, storage not reported.		Reported for June 1, 1919.	
	Stor- ages.	Quantity.	Stor- ages.	Quan- tity.	Stor- ages.	Quan- tity.
Case eggs.....	408	7,508,530	21	97,883	466	6,093,448
Frozen eggs.....	188	16,076,461	8	204,694	207	11,567,804
Creamery butter.....	342	87,851,371	16	1,372,831	371	29,434,782
Packing stock butter.....	134	1,853,276	5	34,119	145	887,796



Comparison of holdings of July 1, 1919, with those of July 1, 1918.  
[Includes totals for those storages reporting for both years.]

Commodity.	Stor- ages.	July 1, 1919 (quantity).	July 1, 1918 (quantity).	Increase or decrease (quantity).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
Case eggs.....	388	6,410,384	7,488,752	+ 1,078,368	+16.8
Frozen eggs.....	173	12,156,921	15,796,917	+ 3,639,996	+29.9
Creamery butter.....	325	47,919,035	87,720,486	+39,801,451	+83.1
Packing stock butter.....	115	4,511,326	1,703,476	- 2,807,850	-62.2

Comparison of holdings of July 1, 1919, with those of June 1, 1919.  
[Includes totals for those storages reporting for both months.]

Commodity.	Stor- ages.	June 1, 1919 (quantity).	July 1, 1919 (quantity).	Increase or decrease (quantity).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
Case eggs.....	399	5,911,991	7,507,570	+ 1,595,579	+ 27.0
Frozen eggs.....	182	11,386,408	16,043,060	+ 4,656,652	+ 40.9
Creamery butter.....	329	28,553,564	87,831,499	+59,277,935	+207.6
Packing stock butter.....	120	878,815	1,847,651	+ 968,836	+110.2

Comparison of holdings of July 1, 1918, with those of June 1, 1918.  
[Includes totals for those storages reporting for both months.]

Commodity.	Stor- ages.	June 1, 1918 (quantity).	July 1, 1918 (quantity).	Increase or decrease (quantity).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
Case eggs.....	448	5,453,280	6,497,861	+ 1,044,581	+ 19.2
Frozen eggs.....	193	11,530,043	12,996,559	+ 1,466,516	+ 12.7
Creamery butter.....	372	13,035,677	48,324,023	+35,288,346	+270.7
Packing stock butter.....	122	3,216,695	4,621,249	+ 1,404,554	+ 43.7

Comparison of holdings of July 1, 1918, with those of July 1, 1917.  
[Includes totals for those storages reporting for both years.]

Commodity.	Stor- ages.	July 1, 1917 (quantity).	July 1, 1918 (quantity).	Increase or decrease (quantity).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
Case eggs.....	462	6,560,268	6,501,860	- 58,408	- 0.9
Frozen eggs.....	176	13,397,699	12,054,533	-1,343,166	-10.0
Creamery butter.....	386	49,981,732	47,436,912	-2,544,820	- 5.1
Packing stock butter.....	104	1,161,399	3,343,680	+2,182,281	+187.9

NOTE.—All commodities are given in terms of pounds, except case eggs, which are given in terms of cases.

Cold-storage holdings of butter and eggs on July 1, 1919, with comparisons of holdings of July 1, 1919, and July 1, 1918, by sections.

Section.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of holdings. <sup>1</sup>			
	Stor- ages.	Quantity.	Stor- ages.	July 1, 1918 (quantity).	July 1, 1919 (quantity).	In- crease or de- crease (per cent).
New England.....	30	813,838	28	808,048	812,104	+ 0.5
Middle Atlantic.....	83	2,312,647	77	1,839,860	2,306,655	+ 25.4
South Atlantic.....	21	106,357	19	75,245	100,257	+ 41.2
North Central (E.).....	74	2,261,718	70	1,955,413	2,255,898	+ 15.4
North Central (W.).....	76	1,233,644	74	1,023,449	1,231,609	+ 19.6
South Central.....	47	311,929	45	258,292	308,224	+ 19.3
Western (N.).....	36	119,092	34	103,218	118,690	+ 15.0
Western (S.).....	41	349,305	41	340,808	349,305	+ 2.5
Total.....	408	7,508,530	388	6,410,384	7,488,752	+ 16.8

## FROZEN EGGS.

Section.	Stor- ages.	Quantity.	Stor- ages.	July 1, 1918 (quantity).	July 1, 1919 (quantity).	In- crease or de- crease (per cent).
New England.....	16	538,864	14	563,049	523,824	- 7.0
Middle Atlantic.....	36	4,416,232	35	4,031,661	4,415,782	+ 9.5
South Atlantic.....	8	527,574	8	366,377	527,574	+ 44.0
North Central (E.).....	38	4,392,458	36	4,038,034	4,383,805	+ 8.6
North Central (W.).....	48	2,693,293	44	2,017,281	2,650,542	+ 31.4
South Central.....	14	281,966	11	218,360	251,746	+ 15.3
Western (N.).....	11	2,715,993	10	371,940	2,582,433	+594.3
Western (S.).....	17	510,081	15	550,219	461,211	- 16.2
Total.....	188	16,076,461	173	12,156,921	15,796,917	+ 29.9

<sup>1</sup>Includes totals for those storages reporting for both dates.

Cold-storage holdings of butter and eggs on July 1, 1919, etc.—Continued.

Section.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of holdings.			
	Stor- ages.	Quantity.	Stor- ages.	July 1, 1918 (quantity).	July 1, 1919 (quantity).	In- crease or de- crease (per cent).
New England.....	30	15,170,522	28	9,836,885	15,138,988	+ 53.4
Middle Atlantic.....	80	32,146,683	78	16,576,714	32,128,329	+ 53.8
South Atlantic.....	26	1,191,374	24	1,151,604	1,189,856	+ 3.3
North Central (E.).....	54	25,357,099	52	10,383,570	25,356,714	+144.2
North Central (W.).....	53	6,242,679	52	4,090,787	6,185,624	+ 52.3
South Central.....	38	1,094,600	34	565,085	1,088,299	+ 92.6
Western (N.).....	28	3,051,434	26	1,674,898	3,039,924	+ 81.3
Western (S.).....	33	3,596,980	31	3,639,492	3,595,752	- 1.2
Total.....	342	87,851,371	325	47,919,035	87,720,485	+ 83.1

## PACKING STOCK BUTTER.

Section.	Stor- ages.	Quantity.	Stor- ages.	July 1, 1918 (quantity).	July 1, 1919 (quantity).	In- crease or de- crease (per cent).
New England.....	2	50	1	50	50	-100.0
Middle Atlantic.....	15	155,337	11	128,489	155,337	- 67.3
South Atlantic.....	9	169,839	5	172,981	154,089	- 10.9
North Central (E.).....	37	1,039,755	32	2,283,275	1,032,158	- 54.8
North Central (W.).....	41	218,571	40	1,602,247	216,619	- 86.5
South Central.....	16	196,307	15	213,160	195,457	- 8.3
Western (N.).....	6	40,897	4	20,160	30,675	+ 52.2
Western (S.).....	8	32,570	7	90,964	32,470	- 64.3
Total.....	134	1,853,276	115	4,511,326	1,703,476	- 62.2

New England: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.

Middle Atlantic: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.

South Atlantic: Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida.

North Central (east of Mississippi River): Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin; (west of Mississippi River): Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas.

South Central: Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas.

Western (north): Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, Oregon; (south): Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, California.

A summary of this report was released by wire on July 14. Upon request any or all of the information contained in the cold-storage reports will be telegraphed immediately upon its release. These reports are free, except for the telegrams, which are sent charges collect.

Report of stocks of frozen and cured meats July 1, 1919.

Product.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Estimated hold- ings, storage not reported.		Reported for June 1, 1919.	
	Stor- ages.	Pounds.	Stor- ages.	Pounds.	Stor- ages.	Pounds.
Frozen beef.....	344	162,386,570	6	448,525	370	164,021,733
Cured beef.....	353	29,217,585	6	101,057	366	27,167,565
Frozen lamb and mut- ton.....	212	7,273,201	6	66,153	222	7,762,944
Frozen pork.....	333	153,894,023	7	1,339,330	354	145,200,589
Dry salt pork.....	474	380,462,828	15	570,757	494	401,904,438
Pickled pork.....	536	421,507,966	16	1,181,982	554	439,833,417
Lard.....	508	91,944,462	18	258,938	600	83,205,484
Miscellaneous meats..	372	86,932,797	40	10,607,103	412	96,513,455

Comparison of stocks of July 1, 1919, with those of July 1, 1918.

[Includes totals for those storages reporting for both dates.]

Product.	Stor- ages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	July 1, 1919 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
Frozen beef.....	330	146,672,220	160,062,203	+13,389,983	+ 9.1
Cured beef.....	339	21,527,827	28,325,161	+ 6,797,334	+ 31.6
Frozen lamb and mutton	196	2,359,359	7,076,201	+ 4,716,842	+199.9
Frozen pork.....	316	94,332,361	148,302,814	+53,970,453	+ 57.2
Dry salt pork.....	455	400,764,197	378,590,605	-22,173,591	- 5.5
Pickled pork.....	517	361,568,840	417,888,822	+56,319,982	+ 15.6
Lard.....	555	107,160,464	91,835,505	-15,324,959	- 14.3
Miscellaneous meats.....	212	62,675,638	64,731,810	+ 2,056,172	+ 3.3

Comparison of stocks of July 1, 1919, with those of June 1, 1919.  
[Includes totals for those storages reporting for both dates.]

Product.	Storages.	June 1, 1919 (pounds).	July 1, 1919 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
Frozen beef.....	339	163,500,809	162,373,205	-1,127,604	-0.7
Cured beef.....	344	26,962,128	29,190,532	+2,228,404	+8.3
Frozen lamb and mutton	200	7,650,854	7,210,274	-440,580	-5.8
Frozen pork.....	327	143,908,998	153,835,459	+9,926,461	+6.9
Dry salt pork.....	461	400,876,289	384,592,473	-16,283,816	-4.1
Pickled pork.....	523	438,320,298	421,467,941	-16,852,357	-3.8
Lard.....	555	82,943,488	91,919,133	+8,975,645	+10.8
Miscellaneous meats.....	348	85,980,086	86,552,110	+572,024	+0.7

Comparison of stocks of July 1, 1918, with those of June 1, 1918.  
[Includes totals for those storages reporting for both dates.]

Product.	Storages.	June 1, 1918 (pounds).	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
Frozen beef.....	339	177,593,064	147,614,563	-29,978,501	-16.9
Cured beef.....	356	24,743,789	21,854,875	-2,888,914	-11.7
Frozen lamb and mutton	197	3,830,287	2,386,188	-1,444,099	-37.7
Frozen pork.....	331	116,235,685	95,128,310	-21,107,375	-18.2
Dry salt pork.....	488	492,967,551	400,743,779	-92,223,772	-18.7
Pickled pork.....	546	393,513,961	348,775,915	-44,738,046	-11.4
Lard.....	591	107,089,142	107,461,952	+372,810	+0.3
Miscellaneous meats.....	190	61,605,181	67,169,282	+5,564,101	+9.0

Quantities cured or frozen and quantities delivered during June, 1919.  
[Includes totals for those storages reporting for both dates.]

Product.	Storages.	June 1, 1919 (pounds).	Cured and frozen during June.	Deliveries during June.	July 1, 1919 (pounds).
Frozen beef.....	290	157,132,179	32,654,715	33,306,782	156,480,112
Cured beef.....	298	24,402,066	12,055,539	9,645,049	26,812,556
Frozen lamb and mutton	160	7,130,018	809,946	1,301,631	6,698,333
Frozen pork.....	289	137,739,672	31,125,193	22,164,850	146,700,015
Dry salt pork.....	398	379,569,352	158,418,846	173,847,724	364,140,474
Pickled pork.....	467	401,675,496	148,115,806	161,894,138	387,937,164
Lard.....	488	76,451,269	94,462,899	85,811,182	85,102,896

NOTE.—Stocks of cured meats include meats in process of curing as well as the cured product. For lard the data show the production during the month instead of the quantity placed in storage.

Stocks of frozen and cured meats on July 1, 1919, with comparisons of the stocks of July 1, 1919, and July 1, 1918, by sections.

## FROZEN BEEF.

Section.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of stocks (includes totals of all storages reporting for both dates).		
	Storages.	Pounds.	Storages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
New England.....	31	10,609,050	30	13,903,431	-23.7
Middle Atlantic.....	82	56,443,931	81	57,329,414	-1.6
South Atlantic.....	15	1,137,544	14	3,272,254	-65.6
North Central (E.).....	69	76,357,342	63	50,018,386	+49.4
North Central (W.).....	61	11,363,919	60	16,213,414	-33.6
South Central.....	28	2,728,353	27	1,474,628	+82.4
Western (N.).....	24	661,274	24	714,980	-7.5
Western (S.).....	34	3,084,957	31	3,745,713	-17.7
Total.....	344	162,386,570	330	146,672,220	+10.9

## CURED BEEF.

Section.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of stocks (includes totals of all storages reporting for both dates).		
	Storages.	Pounds.	Storages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
New England.....	17	1,799,572	17	1,465,007	+22.8
Middle Atlantic.....	100	9,890,245	96	4,516,637	+116.0
South Atlantic.....	26	426,458	25	683,215	-39.6
North Central (E.).....	90	11,993,614	87	8,089,100	+39.2
North Central (W.).....	52	3,388,479	50	5,024,650	-32.7
South Central.....	15	621,585	15	436,311	+42.5
Western (N.).....	23	317,534	21	244,363	+29.5
Western (S.).....	30	781,799	28	1,068,544	-27.2
Total.....	353	29,217,596	339	21,527,827	+34.6

Stocks of frozen and cured meats on July 1, 1919, etc.—Continued.  
FROZEN LAMB AND MUTTON.

Section.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of stocks.		
	Storages.	Pounds.	Storages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
New England.....	19	1,136,307	18	366,917	+209.1
Middle Atlantic.....	55	4,386,719	52	870,653	+439.5
South Atlantic.....	10	120,510	9	137,064	-13.2
North Central (E.).....	39	769,170	34	467,422	+62.9
North Central (W.).....	34	505,936	31	125,995	+263.9
South Central.....	17	147,202	16	44,391	+229.1
Western (N.).....	19	68,869	18	34,843	+96.2
Western (S.).....	19	138,488	18	312,074	-59.2
Total.....	212	7,273,201	196	2,359,359	+199.9

## FROZEN PORK.

Section.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of stocks.		
	Storages.	Pounds.	Storages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
New England.....	29	24,294,932	27	12,367,183	+95.9
Middle Atlantic.....	76	17,476,011	72	15,399,523	+13.3
South Atlantic.....	17	1,807,884	16	1,387,721	+30.3
North Central (E.).....	66	49,664,157	61	32,486,438	+49.5
North Central (W.).....	64	45,029,252	62	22,394,344	+83.0
South Central.....	27	4,805,452	25	2,714,745	+64.0
Western (N.).....	24	2,909,886	24	2,994,574	-2.8
Western (S.).....	30	7,905,449	29	4,587,653	+72.3
Total.....	333	153,894,023	316	94,332,361	+57.2

## DRY SALT PORK.

Section.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of stocks.		
	Storages.	Pounds.	Storages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
New England.....	20	13,751,560	18	14,796,372	-7.1
Middle Atlantic.....	93	29,827,704	89	24,419,868	+14.8
South Atlantic.....	53	7,016,898	50	5,875,491	+18.9
North Central (E.).....	122	143,211,609	118	162,990,076	-12.1
North Central (W.).....	79	170,969,427	77	170,283,536	+0.4
South Central.....	41	10,799,896	39	15,802,758	-31.9
Western (N.).....	31	2,024,341	29	2,159,721	-6.4
Western (S.).....	35	2,881,393	35	4,436,375	-35.5
Total.....	474	380,462,828	455	400,764,197	-5.5

## PICKLED PORK.

Section.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of stocks.		
	Storages.	Pounds.	Storages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
New England.....	31	31,150,292	29	23,214,832	+34.1
Middle Atlantic.....	133	31,374,256	130	41,635,800	-24.9
South Atlantic.....	41	8,641,570	40	6,377,761	+31.4
North Central (E.).....	148	158,899,191	141	134,153,313	+16.1
North Central (W.).....	79	157,773,334	78	132,949,679	+18.7
South Central.....	29	15,653,605	27	8,488,106	+83.8
Western (N.).....	35	8,071,090	34	5,508,918	+46.3
Western (S.).....	40	9,944,628	38	9,242,431	+7.5
Total.....	536	424,507,966	517	361,568,840	+15.6

## LARD.

Section.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of stocks.		
	Storages.	Pounds.	Storages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
New England.....	31	7,392,812	31	17,474,534	-57.7
Middle Atlantic.....	126	8,672,307	121	9,437,608	-8.8
South Atlantic.....	48	1,584,542	45	1,863,659	-15.5
North Central (E.).....	156	42,117,355	155	41,559,206	+1.3
North Central (W.).....	85	25,709,700	84	28,016,450	-8.3
South Central.....	48	2,109,032	47	2,337,568	-9.9
Western (N.).....	34	1,220,872	32	2,760,825	-56.7
Western (S.).....	40	3,137,842	40	3,137,842	-15.4
Total.....	568	91,944,462	555	107,160,404	-14.3

## MISCELLANEOUS MEATS.

Section.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of stocks.		
	Storages.	Pounds.	Storages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
New England.....	25	3,138,722	15	2,780,518	+3.2
Middle Atlantic.....	79	8,281,096	33	2,473,330	+109.3
South Atlantic.....	25	1,680,668	10	497,292	+60.6
North Central (E.).....	99	41,640,105	64	29,804,132	+5.9
North Central (W.).....	63	24,518,623	46	22,230,286	+16.2
South Central.....	29	4,825,714	15	3,665,137	+11.2
Western (N.).....	22	1,178,067	12	113,719	+472.0
Western (S.).....	30	1,669,802	16	1,111,224	-12.1
Total.....	372	86,932,797	212	62,675,638	+13.3

New England: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.

Middle Atlantic: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.

South Atlantic: Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida.

North Central (east of Mississippi River): Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin; (west of Mississippi River): Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas.

South Central: Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas.

Western (north): Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, Oregon; (south): Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, California.

A summary of this report was released by wire on July 14. Upon request any or all the information contained in the storage reports will be telegraphed immediately upon its release. These reports are free, except for the telegrams, which are sent charges collect.



## Report of holdings of frozen poultry July 1, 1919.

Product.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Estimated holdings, firms not reported.		Reported for June 1, 1919.	
	Stor-ages.	Pounds.	Stor-ages.	Pounds.	Stor-ages.	Pounds.
Broilers.....	178	7,383,808	9	53,984	197	8,704,960
Roasters.....	176	10,281,954	7	62,295	199	14,176,396
Fowls.....	193	9,419,332	10	143,293	213	11,114,408
Turkeys.....	200	5,340,278	9	47,453	216	6,351,635
Miscellaneous.....	242	16,470,332	12	60,677	262	15,243,946
Total.....	275	48,895,704	17	387,736	315	55,591,255

## Comparison of holdings of July 1, 1919, with those of July 1, 1918.

[Includes totals for those storages reporting for both dates.]

Product.	Stor-ages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	July 1, 1919 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
Broilers.....	165	1,291,075	7,330,369	+ 6,039,294	+467.8
Roasters.....	163	2,305,312	10,185,972	+ 7,880,660	+341.8
Fowls.....	174	4,204,390	9,047,925	+ 4,843,535	+115.2
Turkeys.....	182	4,209,648	5,282,660	+ 1,073,012	+ 25.5
Miscellaneous.....	218	4,973,959	15,884,502	+10,910,543	+219.4
Total.....	239	16,984,864	47,731,428	+30,746,564	+181.0

## Comparison of holdings of July 1, 1919, with those of June 1, 1919.

[Includes totals for those storages reporting for both dates.]

Product.	Stor-ages.	June 1, 1919 (pounds).	July 1, 1919 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
Broilers.....	174	8,641,747	7,379,702	-1,262,045	-14.6
Roasters.....	175	14,090,853	10,275,719	-3,815,134	-27.1
Fowls.....	186	10,947,788	9,410,241	-1,537,547	-14.0
Turkeys.....	195	6,295,610	5,333,998	- 961,612	-15.3
Miscellaneous.....	235	15,177,632	16,466,422	+1,288,790	+ 8.5
Total.....	266	55,153,630	48,866,082	-6,287,548	-11.4

## Comparison of holdings of July 1, 1918, with those of June 1, 1918.

[Includes totals for those storages reporting for both dates.]

Product.	Stor-ages.	June 1, 1918 (pounds).	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	Increase or decrease (pounds).	Increase or decrease (per cent).
Broilers.....	187	1,717,404	1,311,800	- 405,604	-23.6
Roasters.....	186	3,922,071	2,320,322	-1,601,749	-40.8
Fowls.....	205	2,708,272	4,233,976	+1,525,704	+56.3
Turkeys.....	197	5,906,699	4,233,456	-1,673,243	-28.3
Miscellaneous.....	235	4,611,548	5,781,039	+1,169,491	+25.4
Total.....	284	18,865,994	17,880,593	- 985,401	- 5.2

## Holdings of frozen poultry on July 1, 1919, with comparisons of the holdings of July 1, 1919, and July 1, 1918, by sections.

## TOTAL FROZEN POULTRY.

Section.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of holdings. <sup>1</sup>			
	Stor-ages.	Pounds.	Stor-ages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	July 1, 1919 (pounds).	In-crease or de-crease (per cent).
New England.....	27	5,231,705	23	2,079,872	5,210,155	+150.5
Middle Atlantic.....	66	18,978,193	57	7,850,595	18,411,552	+134.5
South Atlantic.....	17	776,675	14	466,944	723,632	+ 55.0
North Central (E.).....	45	16,525,073	43	3,856,116	16,255,466	+321.6
North Central (W.).....	52	4,651,203	46	980,425	4,444,101	+353.3
South Central.....	23	747,061	21	468,043	721,496	+ 54.2
Western (N.).....	18	527,536	16	79,252	525,746	+563.4
Western (S.).....	27	1,458,258	19	1,203,617	1,439,280	+ 19.6
Total.....	275	48,895,704	239	16,984,864	47,731,428	+181.0

<sup>1</sup> Includes totals of all storages reporting for both dates.

## Holdings of frozen poultry on July 1, 1919, etc.—Continued.

## BROILERS.

Section.	Reported for July 1, 1919.		Comparison of holdings.			
	Stor-ages.	Pounds.	Stor-ages.	July 1, 1918 (pounds).	July 1, 1919 (pounds).	In-crease or de-crease (per cent).
New England.....	15	652,314	14	127,350	651,514	+ 411.6
Middle Atlantic.....	45	2,256,276	40	451,525	2,219,225	+ 391.5
South Atlantic.....	8	87,442	8	26,154	87,442	+ 234.3
North Central (E.).....	34	3,364,653	31	292,724	3,353,319	+1,045.6
North Central (W.).....	32	384,905	29	42,420	393,144	+ 826.8
South Central.....	15	189,791	14	12,893	187,298	+1,352.4
Western (N.).....	10	46,442	10	8,828	46,442	+ 426.1
Western (S.).....	19	391,985	19	329,178	391,985	+ 19.1
Total.....	178	7,383,808	165	1,291,075	7,330,369	+ 467.8

## ROASTERS.

New England.....	20	1,177,192	20	331,622	1,177,192	+208.5
Middle Atlantic.....	49	4,757,640	44	1,059,936	4,734,048	+346.6
South Atlantic.....	9	158,350	7	93,881	127,947	+ 33.3
North Central (E.).....	30	3,231,840	26	616,946	3,209,664	+419.8
North Central (W.).....	31	647,166	30	25,580	636,590	.....
South Central.....	10	56,942	9	2,178	50,707	.....
Western (N.).....	11	130,473	11	535	130,473	.....
Western (S.).....	16	122,351	16	125,134	122,351	- 2.2
Total.....	176	10,281,954	163	2,305,812	10,185,972	+341.8

## FOWLS.

New England.....	22	1,137,212	21	444,957	1,135,712	+155.2
Middle Atlantic.....	51	2,465,251	45	1,847,658	2,210,334	+ 19.6
South Atlantic.....	10	324,359	8	68,821	302,281	+339.2
North Central (E.).....	30	3,733,974	26	1,014,090	3,663,244	+261.4
North Central (W.).....	37	1,102,280	33	369,482	1,089,189	+194.8
South Central.....	14	149,249	13	165,930	141,214	- 14.9
Western (N.).....	10	152,250	9	26,851	151,194	+463.1
Western (S.).....	19	354,757	19	266,801	354,757	+ 33.1
Total.....	193	9,419,332	174	4,204,890	9,047,925	+115.2

## TURKEYS.

New England.....	24	976,004	20	555,656	961,354	+ 73.0
Middle Atlantic.....	54	2,487,771	48	2,019,967	2,468,431	+ 22.2
South Atlantic.....	9	148,460	8	79,615	148,400	+ 86.5
North Central (E.).....	33	920,523	30	902,015	915,868	+ 1.5
North Central (W.).....	31	197,838	29	92,602	188,600	+103.7
South Central.....	17	196,810	16	149,571	190,560	+ 27.4
Western (N.).....	12	50,642	12	29,100	50,642	+ 74.0
Western (S.).....	20	362,230	19	381,122	358,745	- 5.9
Total.....	200	5,340,278	182	4,209,648	5,282,660	+ 25.5

## MISCELLANEOUS POULTRY.

New England.....	21	1,288,983	20	570,287	1,284,383	+125.2
Middle Atlantic.....	58	7,611,255	49	2,471,509	6,779,514	+174.3
South Atlantic.....	12	58,064	11	198,473	57,502	- 71.0
North Central (E.).....	40	5,274,083	36	1,030,341	5,116,371	+396.6
North Central (W.).....	49	2,309,014	44	450,341	2,136,578	+374.4
South Central.....	22	154,269	21	137,468	151,717	+ 10.4
Western (N.).....	18	147,729	16	13,938	146,995	+954.6
Western (S.).....	22	226,935	21	101,582	211,442	+108.1
Total.....	242	16,470,332	218	4,973,939	15,884,502	+219.4

New England: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.

Middle Atlantic: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.

South Atlantic: Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida.

North Central (east of Mississippi River): Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin; (west of Mississippi River): Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas.

South Central: Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas.

Western (north): Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, Oregon; (south): Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, California.

A summary of this report was released by wire on July 14. Upon request any or all the information contained in the storage reports will be telegraphed immediately upon its release. These reports are free, except for the telegrams, which are sent charges collect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also desire to introduce a statement from the same source of the exports of domestic merchandise. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Exports of domestic merchandise.  
(12 months ending June 30.)

Article.	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919
Barley.....bushels..	6,644,747	26,754,522	27,473,160	16,381,077	26,285,378	20,457,781
Corn.....do.....	9,380,855	48,786,291	38,217,012	64,720,842	40,997,827	16,687,538
Corn meal.....barrels..	336,241	470,503	419,979	508,113	2,018,859	1,883,327
Oatmeal.....pounds..	15,998,286	68,394,979	54,748,747	110,903,344	346,559,435	227,587,679
Oats.....bushels..	1,859,949	96,809,551	95,918,884	88,944,401	105,837,399	96,360,974
Wheat.....do.....	92,399,775	259,642,533	173,274,015	149,831,427	34,118,833	178,582,073
Wheat flour.....barrels..	11,821,461	16,182,765	15,520,669	11,942,778	21,879,951	24,190,093
Beef, canned.....pounds..	3,464,733	75,243,261	50,803,765	67,536,125	370,032,900	332,205,176
Beef, fresh.....do.....	6,394,404	170,440,934	231,214,000	197,177,101	54,467,910	45,087,881
Beef, pickled.....do.....	23,235,974	31,874,743	38,114,682	58,053,667	667,151,972	59,092,322
Oleo oil.....do.....	97,017,065	80,481,946	102,645,914	67,110,111	815,294,424	1,239,540,973
Bacon.....do.....	193,964,252	46,718,227	579,808,786	667,151,972	419,571,899	667,848,019
Ham and shoulders.....do.....	165,881,791	203,701,114	282,208,611	236,656,581	392,506,355	725,577,888
Lard.....do.....	481,457,792	475,531,908	427,011,338	444,769,540	17,576,240	17,395,889
Neutral lard.....do.....	29,323,788	26,021,054	34,426,590	5,896,126	5,194,468	5,273,508
Pork, canned.....do.....	3,074,303	4,644,418	9,610,732	50,435,615	21,390,288	19,644,388
Pork, fresh.....do.....	2,668,020	3,908,193	63,005,524	46,992,721	33,221,502	31,734,497
Pork, pickled.....do.....	45,543,085	45,655,574	63,460,713	26,835,092	17,735,966	33,739,960
Butter.....do.....	2,427,577	9,850,704	13,487,481	44,394,301	44,303,076	18,794,853
Cheese.....do.....	2,427,577	55,362,917	44,394,301	66,050,013	528,759,232	728,740,509
Milk, condensed.....pounds..	16,209,082	37,235,627	159,577,620	259,141,231	100,779,981	178,709,833
Cottonseed oil.....do.....	192,963,079	318,366,525	266,512,057	158,911,767		

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in my judgment these figures absolutely refute the position taken by Senator REED in a recent speech made by him on the subject of cold storage and the high cost of living generally.

It will be noted that no eggs have been exported at all, and while there is a greater supply of eggs in this country than ever before, the prices have gone up this year over last.

It will also be noted in the case of butter that in 1918 there were, in round numbers, 17,000,000 pounds of butter exported, and in 1919, 33,000,000 pounds, a difference of 16,000,000 pounds. This would seem to uphold a contention of Senator REED, but when we look at the butter on hand this year and that on hand in 1918, it will be seen how misleading Senator REED's figures are. The 16,000,000 pounds additional exports for 1919 is considerable when considered in connection with the enormous increase of the holding of butter on August 1, 1919. There was a holding of butter of 124,839,792 pounds on August 1, 1919. On August 1, 1918, there were 88,786,243 pounds of butter, an increase of 40 per cent. The increase in pounds, in round numbers, is 36,000,000 pounds. You could subtract from this 36,000,000 pounds the 16,000,000 pounds exported and we still would have 20,000,000 pounds more of butter in 1919 than we had in 1918.

Again, take the figures for cheese. In round numbers there were 26,000,000 pounds less of cheese exported in 1919 than in 1918, and yet in 1919, in round numbers, there were 75,000,000 pounds on hand, while in 1918 there were about 26,000,000 pounds on hand, and still cheese has gone up.

Take beef. There were 370,000,000 pounds exported in 1918 and 332,000,000 pounds in 1919, while there was on hand in 1919 159,000,000 pounds and in 1918 172,000,000 pounds, and yet beef has gone up.

In other words, there were 38,000,000 pounds less exported, which, added to the 159,000,000 pounds on hand in 1919, would make more than there was on hand in 1918, including the exports, and yet prices have gone up.

## POULTRY.

Again, take the matter of poultry. In round numbers there were 40,000,000 pounds of poultry on August 1, 1919, as against 18,000,000 pounds in 1918. Apparently we exported more poultry, and yet the price has gone up  $4\frac{1}{2}$  cents per pound. These figures are irrefutable and no amount of mathematical legerdemain can disprove them.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an advertisement of the Sanitary Grocery Co. (Inc.), of Washington, D. C., as it appeared in the Evening Star of Monday, August 18, 1919. The advertisement is headed:

Passing the buck. It is a great national pastime, but we refuse to let anyone pass it to us.

The advertisement, among other things, says:

We are going to show just how much truth there is in the statement made by Mr. L. B. H. Weld before the House Agricultural Committee, as reported in the Star and which we reproduce herewith. Mr. Weld is quoted as saying that eggs which represent the cost to the retailer of 45 cents per dozen were sold to the consumer at 75 and 80 cents per dozen. We challenge Mr. Weld or anyone else to produce evidence that anyone ever sold cold-storage eggs in Washington at such a price.

It appears that the next day Mr. Weld denied that he had made such a statement as attributed to him in the Star, and the Star admitted that he had made no such statement, and there-

upon there appeared another advertisement from the Sanitary Grocery Co. to the effect that inasmuch as Mr. Weld did not charge that the Washington retailers had sold eggs at 75 to 80 cents per dozen, they considered the matter ended, and I believe apologized to Mr. Weld.

Mr. President, that is all right so far as the Washington retailers are concerned, but the figures submitted by Mr. Weld and the figures given in this advertisement were conclusive that Mr. Weld had, either intentionally or unintentionally, misrepresented the facts and had misrepresented the profits received by the packers on eggs.

From page 267 of the hearings of the Committee on Agriculture, cold-storage legislation, part 6, I quote as follows from Mr. Weld's testimony:

Approximate average marketing cost of eggs, Iowa to Washington, D. C., 1918.

Price paid farmer in Iowa.....	\$0.33
Expense of handling, grading, and freight.....	.03 $\frac{1}{2}$
Cost net storage in Chicago.....	.36 $\frac{1}{2}$
Storage expense (storage, insurance, and interest).....	.03
Freight to Washington.....	.01 $\frac{1}{2}$
Selling, candling, and grading, including spoilage.....	.03
Total profit storage and selling.....	.01

Price delivered retail in Washington......45

Now, it may be true that Weld was misquoted as to what the retailer sold the eggs for in Washington, but he is not misquoted as to what the packer sold the eggs for, delivered to the retailers in Washington. Mr. Weld says that they were delivered to the retailer in Washington for 45 cents, and the packers made a total profit of 1 cent per dozen. The figures submitted by the Sanitary Grocery Co. show that this statement is not true, but that the eggs were delivered from the packers at an average of about 50 cents per dozen, or about 4 cents to 5 cents more profit per dozen on eggs than Mr. Weld testified. In other words, Mr. Weld may have made his peace with the retailers in Washington, but he has simply "passed the buck" to the people.

The argument was made that because of our increased exportation of poultry prices of poultry are higher. As a matter of fact, we do not export poultry, and there is three times as much poultry on hand this year as there was last year. If the law of supply and demand is in force, of course the price ought to be cheaper, but as a matter of fact it is  $4\frac{1}{2}$  cents a pound higher. So it is with cheese, with beef, with lambs and mutton and almost all articles of food. The stocks on hand in this country are enormously increased over those on hand last year, and at the same time the prices have increased, and I say have increased largely over what we have exported as well, taking those figures into consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Does not the Senator really believe it is a splendid thing to have more poultry, butter, and meat on hand in cold-storage plants to-day than there was a year ago?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am delighted to know that there is, and it ought to be correspondingly cheaper to the people. It is not a good thing unless the people get the advantage of it. What good is it to the people of the United States if it is held in cold storage waiting for higher prices?



Mr. SMOOT. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that last year the exports were so heavy that they could not get the usual quantity of poultry and food products into the cold-storage plants.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not exportations of poultry, because poultry is not exported.

Mr. SMOOT. I saw only yesterday a statement that the Government now has in cold-storage plants in New York nearly 2,000,000 pounds of poultry.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is for our Army.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; but it is for exportation.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is exportation in one sense, and in another sense it is not. As a matter of fact, that does not mean exportation. Sending it to our troops abroad is not exporting it. I have here a report from the Department of Agriculture which shows that there is no exportation of poultry.

Mr. SMOOT. I am only speaking of the exportation of poultry that went to our Army, because our Army was fed poultry, I think, two days a week. I know that the Government has millions of pounds of poultry in cold-storage plants in this country. This is what I want to have borne in mind. It must be conceded by everyone that now is the time that the greatest quantities of butter and poultry should be found in cold storage, as the time of year for the greatest production has passed, and unless there is more in cold-storage plants in the country than there was a year ago at this time the prices during the coming winter will be even higher, if possible, than they were last winter. The Senator knows that poultry was sold at 90 cents a pound, and it was sold less than a month ago at 75 cents a pound here in the District.

So, Mr. President, I think where cold storage is regulated as to the length of time products may remain there, it is a godsend to the American people that there is a cold-storage system in the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. No one disputes that; and if the Senator means to say that he is in favor of regulation so as to make the packers and other cold-storage men do right, so as to make them obey the law of supply and demand, I agree with him entirely. What I have asked for is the just regulation of cold storage. Nothing more. Of course, any man on earth with any sense knows that cold storage is one of the greatest benefactions to the human race. Nobody is against cold storage.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood that the Senator was complaining of the amount of butter in cold storage and the amount of poultry in cold-storage plants to-day.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; the Senator misunderstood me entirely. What I say is that under the cold-storage system now, unregulated, those who are engaged in the cold-storage business or the food business, and who use cold storage, can withhold the products from market at will or put them on the market at will, thus controlling the prices of food to the people; that the law of supply and demand is not in force as to them, because, practically without cost after having gone into cold storage, they can withhold products or put them on the market at will. That ought not to be the case. They ought to be regulated and forced to do what cold storage was intended for, to carry over from the season of plenty to the season of scarcity and give the people food during all seasons at reasonable prices.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is absolutely true, and I think, generally speaking, that is done. I know if we had no cold storage for eggs, for instance, the price of eggs last winter would have been \$2 a dozen. The Senator knows that there is a propaganda all over the United States to try to make the American people believe that the cause of high prices to-day is the cold-storage system. For instance, I notice that the papers report 5,000,000 eggs on hand in a cold-storage plant in the South. Never before was the quantity reported except in cases. To state to-day to the American people that there were 3,000 cases of eggs on hand does not sound like very many eggs, but multiplied by the number of eggs that there are in a case it seems quite a number.

There should be in the United States cold storage of all necessities of life sufficient to carry the supply over during the season in which there is little or no production.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator entirely about that. There is no difference between us on that point.

Mr. SMOOT. Any legislation that interferes with such a course will be most expensive legislation to the American people.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator entirely in his last statement that there should be no interference with cold storage itself. The proper uses of cold storage should be encouraged rather than hindered. The bill which I have introduced and which is now before the Committee on Interstate Commerce does not in the slightest degree affect the proper use of cold storage or the institution of cold storage. The only thing it does is to reinstate the law of supply and demand as to food

products kept in cold storage so that those who use cold storage can not use it for the purpose of boosting prices at will or controlling prices. That is the substance of what is provided for in the bill.

Now, let us see how it works, Senators, about propaganda. There is propaganda on both sides. On last Monday afternoon there was an advertisement printed in the Washington Star called "Passing the buck," and I desire to insert that advertisement in the Record. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Monday, Aug. 18, 1919.]

"PASSING THE BUCK"—IT'S THE GREAT NATIONAL PASTIME, BUT WE REFUSE TO LET ANYONE PASS IT TO US.

We are going to show just how much truth there is in the statement made by Mr. L. B. H. Weld before the House Agriculture Committee as reported in the Star and which we reproduce herewith. Mr. Weld is quoted as saying that eggs which represented a cost to the retailer of 45 cents per dozen were sold to consumers for 75 cents and 80 cents per dozen. We challenge Mr. Weld or anyone else to produce evidence for the statement that anyone ever sold cold-storage eggs in Washington at such a price.

In the first place he is speaking of cold-storage eggs—that is, eggs which were carried from the spring until fall in cold-storage warehouses. We handle a few eggs ourselves, and the accusation of profiteering rests upon us as well as all other retailers. We feel that the public is fair-minded, and we are going to present a few figures. You can then judge for yourself as to who, if anyone, profiteered, especially as Mr. Weld says that 45 cents was the price at which the retailer should have bought these eggs.

If 45 cents per dozen was the price, why were we compelled to pay Swift & Co. the figures as shown on the immediate right?

Recapitulation of purchases.

	Dozens.	Cost.
Swift & Co.	9,450	\$4,656.75
Armour & Co.	12,000	5,640.00
Morris & Co.	24,750	12,420.00
Cudahy Packing Co.	23,910	14,437.60
Other purchases.	6,750	3,465.00
Total.	82,860	40,618.75

Eighty-two thousand eight hundred and sixty dozen cold storage—or, as the newspaper reporters write it, nearly 1,000,000 eggs; to be exact it figures 994,320. Merely to show you that our egg distribution is a vital factor when considering a matter of this kind.

We do not mention any purchases after January 1, 1919, as shortly thereafter we began handling fresh eggs only. Compare these figures with our cost prices on same date.

Evidence in black and white as to what these eggs retailed for in our store.

These prices taken from our advertisements which appeared in the Evening Star:

	Cents per dozen.
Quoted Oct. 21, 1918 (cold-storage eggs)	50
Quoted Nov. 7, 1918 (cold-storage eggs)	50
Quoted Nov. 11, 1918 (cold-storage eggs)	52
Quoted Nov. 21, 1918 (cold-storage eggs)	55
Quoted Nov. 25, 1918 (cold-storage eggs)	57

See any 75-cent or 80-cent prices here?

For the month of December no advertised prices were shown, but our records show that notwithstanding increased cost to us our price on cold-storage eggs never exceeded 57 cents. Also remember that the District Food Administration was in full swing until after January 1, 1919. Let us quote from the fair price list in the Evening Star of December 6, 1918:

"Cold-storage eggs—dealer pays 50 cents to 55 cents, sells 57 cents to 63 cents."

Shortly after January 1 we discontinued the sale of storage eggs, as it is usual for us to do each year.

Prices following were quoted by us in the Evening Star on each date indicated:

Our selling price on fresh eggs was  
(See any 75-cent or 80-cent eggs here?)

	Cents.
Jan. 6	72
Jan. 9	72
Jan. 13	72
Jan. 16	65
Jan. 20	65
Jan. 23	65
Jan. 27	65
Jan. 30	65
Feb. 3	55
Feb. 6	45
Feb. 10	45
Feb. 13	45
Feb. 17	45
Feb. 20	45
Feb. 24	45
Feb. 27	45
Mar. 3	45
Mar. 6	45
Mar. 10	45
Mar. 13	45
Mar. 17	45
Mar. 20	43
Mar. 26	43
Mar. 27	43

## EGG PURCHASES FROM SWIFT &amp; CO.

[Cold-storage eggs.]

All purchases were made by the John C. Letts Grocery Co. (Inc.), and delivered to our various stores from warehouse at 52 O Street NW. to be retailed. All other purchases indicated in this advertisement were made in the same manner.

	Dozens.	Cost per dozen.	Value.
1918.		Cents.	
Purchased Nov. 15.....	3,000	47	\$1,410.00
Purchased Nov. 16.....	750	47	352.50
Purchased Nov. 25.....	1,500	51½	772.50
Purchased Nov. 27.....	750	51½	386.25
Purchased Nov. 29.....	1,350	51½	695.25
Purchased Nov. 30.....	600	51½	309.00
Purchased Dec. 4.....	1,500	48½	731.25
Total.....	9,450		4,656.75

Evidently none of Mr. Weld's 45-cent eggs from Swift & Co. Here are a few more purchases—all cold-storage stock:

From Armour & Co.—cold-storage eggs, 1918.  
(Find any 45-cent eggs here?)

Nov. 4, 3,000 dozen at 46 cents.....	\$1,380.00
Nov. 5, 3,000 dozen at 46 cents.....	1,380.00
Nov. 7, 3,000 dozen at 46 cents.....	1,380.00
Dec. 5, 1,500 dozen at 50 cents.....	750.00
Dec. 5, 1,500 dozen at 50 cents.....	750.00

Total (12,000 dozen)..... 5,640.00

From Morris & Co.—cold-storage eggs, 1918.  
(Or here?)

Nov. 7, 750 dozen at 48 cents.....	\$360.00
Nov. 21, 750 dozen at 49 cents.....	367.50
Nov. 22, 120 dozen at 49 cents.....	58.80
Nov. 22, 150 dozen at 49 cents.....	73.50
Nov. 23, 480 dozen at 49 cents.....	235.20
Nov. 25, 1,500 dozen at 49 cents.....	735.00
Nov. 25, 750 dozen at 49 cents.....	367.50
Nov. 27, 750 dozen at 49 cents.....	367.50
Nov. 30, 750 dozen at 49 cents.....	367.50
Dec. 2, 750 dozen at 49 cents.....	367.50
Dec. 10, 1,500 dozen at 49 cents.....	735.00
Dec. 13, 600 dozen at 49 cents.....	294.00
Dec. 13, 13,500 dozen at 51 cents.....	6,885.00
Dec. 20, 450 dozen at 49 cents.....	220.50
Dec. 23, 450 dozen at 49 cents.....	220.50
Dec. 23, 1,500 dozen at 51 cents.....	765.00

Total (24,750 dozen)..... 12,420.00

From Cudahy Packing Co.—Cold-storage eggs, 1918.  
(Yes, here, but why didn't they stay there?)

Nov. 4, 750 dozen, at 44½ cents.....	\$333.75
Nov. 8, 3,000 dozen, at 44½ cents.....	1,335.00
Nov. 9, 750 dozen, at 44½ cents.....	333.75
Nov. 11, 1,500 dozen, at 46 cents.....	690.00
Nov. 12, 1,200 dozen, at 46 cents.....	552.00
Nov. 12, 1,500 dozen, at 46 cents.....	690.00
Nov. 14, 1,860 dozen, at 46 cents.....	855.60
Nov. 18, 1,500 dozen, at 47 cents.....	712.50
Nov. 19, 1,500 dozen, at 47½ cents.....	712.50
Nov. 20, 1,500 dozen, at 48½ cents.....	727.50
Nov. 21, 1,500 dozen, at 48½ cents.....	727.50
Nov. 22, 1,500 dozen, at 48 cents.....	727.50
Nov. 26, 2,250 dozen, at 49 cents.....	1,102.50
Nov. 27, 2,250 dozen, at 49 cents.....	1,102.50
Nov. 30, 1,500 dozen, at 49 cents.....	735.00
Dec. 20, 1,500 dozen, at 53 cents.....	795.00
Dec. 21, 2,100 dozen, at 53 cents.....	1,113.00
Dec. 23, 750 dozen, at 53 cents.....	397.50
Dec. 23, 1,500 dozen, at 53 cents.....	795.00

Total (29,910 dozen)..... 14,437.60

Other purchases cold-storage eggs, 1918.

Nov. 18, 1,500 dozen, at 50 cents.....	\$750.00
Nov. 19, 1,500 dozen, at 50 cents.....	750.00
Nov. 23, 1,500 dozen, at 52 cents.....	780.00
Nov. 26, 1,500 dozen, at 52 cents.....	780.00
Dec. 13, 750 dozen, at 54 cents.....	405.00

Total (6,750 dozen)..... 3,465.00

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 16.]

RETAILER'S PROFIT ON EGGS INDICATED—L. B. H. WELD COMPARES PRICE CHARGED WITH COST OF DELIVERY ON MARKET.

While consumers in Washington were paying 75 and 80 cents a dozen for eggs last winter they represented an investment of 33 cents to the farmer and 45 cents delivered to the retailer, according to testimony by L. B. H. Weld, manager of commercial research for Swift & Co., before the House Agricultural Committee, which is investigating the high price of cold-storage products.

The price paid for the eggs to a farmer in Iowa, according to Mr. Weld, was 33 cents a dozen. Expense of handling, grading, and freight was 3½ cents, making a total cost of 36½ cents in the cold storage in Chicago. Storage expense is 3 cents, freight to Washington, 1½ cents; selling, candling, grading, and spoilage, 3 cents; and profits of storage and selling is 1 cent. This brings the total to 45 cents a dozen, when the eggs reach the Washington retailers.

Mr. Weld estimated that 62 to 66 per cent of the retail price goes to the farmer if eggs are sold at 50 or 53 cents.

Mr. Weld told the committee that profit of the packers on beef and veal in storage is about one-half cent a pound. He said that the beef brought to Washington has been killed only two weeks.

[From the Sunday Star, Aug. 17, 1919. First page, column 8.]

BELIEVE RETAILERS PROFITEER.

While the packers and other big corporate interests may be responsible for a general boosting of prices throughout the country, the members of the District committees have been told that retail dealers here have been profiteering. The Federal Trade Commission report on the high prices of shoes made it plain that the commission had found the retail dealers making exorbitant profits. The testimony of a commercial expert for one of the packers before the House Committee on Agriculture showed exactly what it cost to buy eggs from farmers in Iowa and to deliver them to the retailer in Washington—45 cents at a time that the consumer was being charged 75 and 80 cents.

These two instances are a matter of record before Congress, and Members of the House committee say they can produce similar testimony along other lines.

Why let an outsider come into Washington and bring an accusation of this kind against hundreds of reputable merchants of this city? Ask him to prove it with figures.

We are in hopes the House Agricultural Committee will recall Mr. Weld and have him tell them what became of all the 45-cent eggs that Washington dealers were not able to buy even from the firm he "researches" for.

We have researched several times ourselves—and haven't found many. When you read testimony of this character about how the retail grocer has been gouging you

Call on us. Perhaps we can pull the facts and figures and prove to you that

You have been misinformed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to read from that advertisement these words:

"Passing the buck."

It's the great national pastime. But we refuse to let anyone pass it to us.

We are going to show just how much truth there is in the statement made by Mr. L. B. H. Weld before the House Agricultural Committee as reported in the Star and which we reproduce herewith. Mr. Weld is quoted as saying that eggs which represented a cost to the retailer of 45 cents per dozen were sold to consumers for 75 cents and 80 cents per dozen. We challenge Mr. Weld or anyone else to produce evidence for the statement that anyone ever sold cold-storage eggs in Washington at such a price.

That advertisement is signed by the Sanitary Grocery Co., of Washington, D. C. It is rather a remarkable fact that on the next day another advertisement came out in the Star about this matter, in which the Sanitary Grocery Co. admitted that they had misquoted Mr. Weld in reference to certain matters contained in that report. The advertisement was to the effect that Mr. Weld had brought proof to them that he had not said that the retailers of Washington had retailed those eggs at 75 cents a dozen, but had said they were sold at some 50-odd cents a dozen, and they therefore made Mr. Weld an apology for having advertised the matter in the way they did. But, unfortunately for Mr. Weld and for those whom he represents, when he got the Sanitary Grocery Co.'s apology he was simply "passing the buck" to the American people.

I want to read to the Senate just what Mr. Weld did say, for it is very short. I read from his testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture. I desire to call the especial attention of the Senate to these figures submitted by Mr. Weld:

Approximate average marketing cost of eggs, Iowa to Washington, D. C., 1918, price paid to farmer in Iowa, 33 cents.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] is present and can tell what the farmers of his State got for eggs last year.

Expense of handling, grading, and freight, 3½ cents.

Making total of 36½ cents in Iowa.

Cost into storage in Chicago, 36½ cents.

To that Mr. Weld adds:

Storage expense (storage, insurance, and interest), 3 cents.

Freight to Washington, 1½ cents.

Selling, candling, and grading (including spoilage), 3 cents.

Total profit (storage and selling), 1 cent.

That is the total profit to the packer.

Price delivered to retailer in Washington, 45 cents.

In other words, Mr. Weld's testimony is to the effect the packers were not profiteering but were making only 1 cent a dozen upon eggs. That is the reasonable inference from his testimony. I take it that there can not be any dispute about that.

The advertisement that the Sanitary Grocery Co. published on Monday last produces the bills and the amounts of money paid by it to the packers. Senators can read the advertisement in the RECORD. There are in it to be found quite a number of bills mounting into the thousands of dozens of eggs and thousands of dollars. The average price is a little less than 50 cents a dozen to retailers here in Washington. In other words, instead of the packers, according to Mr. Weld's testimony and according to these paid bills for eggs bought by the Sanitary Grocery Co., being delivered to the retailers in Washington at a cent profit to the packers, they were delivered according to this proof, at between 5 and 6 cents profit to the packers per dozen. Of course, a little difference of 4 or 5 cents Mr. Weld may not think material, but considering the millions of dozens of eggs that are sold in this country the difference will be very great. Mr.



Weld evidently desired to submit to the committee that the packers' profit was only 1 cent per dozen. He evidently believed that was a reasonable profit. He thought that would appeal to anyone as reasonable. The figures of this advertisement show that the packers made, in round numbers, 5 cents additional on the very eggs Mr. Weld was talking about. Five cents a dozen would mean a great saving to many families buying eggs.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Were any of the eggs sold here to dealers at the prices suggested by Mr. Weld?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will give the prices to the Senator. The grocery company bought, it seems, from several cold-storage houses, several packing companies. On November 4, 3,000 dozen at 46 cents; on November 5, 3,000 dozen at 46 cents; on November 7, 3,000 dozen at 46 cents; on December 5, 1,500 dozen at 50 cents; and on December 5, 1,500 dozen at 50 cents.

From Morris & Co.—all of these are cold-storage eggs—they bought on November 7, 750 dozen at 48 cents; November 21, 750 dozen at 49 cents; November 22, 120 dozen at 49 cents.

Mr. Weld testified they were all delivered here at 45 cents.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That they were all delivered at 45 cents?

Mr. McKELLAR. He figured that they were all delivered at 45 cents.

Now, so that the Senate may have the figures showing that the price goes considerably above this amount, I read the following:

150 dozen, at 49 cents.  
480 dozen, at 49 cents.  
1,500 dozen, at 49 cents.  
750 dozen, at 49 cents.  
750 dozen, at 49 cents.  
750 dozen, at 49 cents.  
750 dozen, at 49 cents.  
1,500 dozen, at 49 cents.  
600 dozen, at 49 cents.  
13,500 dozen, at 51 cents.  
410 dozen, at 49 cents.  
450 dozen, at 49 cents.  
1,500 dozen, at 51 cents.

From the Cudahy Packing Co. the prices were on November 4, 44½ cents per dozen, and on December 23, 53 cents. Other prices run for other cold-storage eggs bought from other companies from 50 cents to 54 cents. In other words, the lowest price was 44½ cents a dozen and the highest price was 54 cents—an average of between 49 and 50 cents.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The testimony shows, then, that in some cases eggs were sold here at a price less than the price testified to by Mr. Weld.

Mr. McKELLAR. In only a few cases.

Mr. TOWNSEND. In only a few cases.

Mr. McKELLAR. Only as to 4,500 dozen.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator from Tennessee is basing this all on Iowa eggs.

Mr. McKELLAR. On Iowa eggs; yes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Has the price of Iowa eggs remained the same during all of the period covered by these shipments?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not explained whether it has or not. Are Iowa eggs, for instance, different from Michigan eggs? I do not know that there is any difference between them.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am thinking about Michigan eggs.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are Michigan eggs better than Iowa eggs?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know something about eggs, but I did not know that there was that difference between eggs coming from Iowa and those coming from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Of course, there are no better eggs in the world than Michigan eggs; but what I desire to get at is that the price of eggs in Michigan, as I suppose in every other place, differs from week to week, and sometimes from day to day.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course it does.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I was wondering how the Senator could fix the price at 33 cents, or whatever the Senator did fix it at, and say that he is comparing that with the selling price for that whole period, without knowing what the eggs actually cost.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will remember that I am not fixing these prices or this method of arriving at prices at all; but what I am doing is what the Senator is doing—criticizing what the agent of the packers has done when he undertakes to fix the price at which the retailers in Washington receive their eggs at 45 cents a dozen. Of course that is not correct; anybody in the world would know that it was not correct.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I am very much in favor of the object the Senator from Tennessee has in getting exact information, for unless we do have all the facts and all the circumstances surrounding them, statements will be misleading and of no value to us at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If we could find a particular shipment of eggs and could trace that shipment from the farmer to the consumer, we would obtain some information that would be exceedingly valuable to us in determining whether or not there has been profiteering.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say to the Senator, in answer to his suggestion, that the set of figures in this advertisement is as perfect proof as any I have seen. Evidently the Sanitary Grocery Co., of Washington, felt that it had not been profiteering, and according to its figures it surely had not; and evidently the Sanitary Grocery Co., of Washington, to use its own language, wanted to "pass the buck" to some one else. I am using simply the language employed by it. It does give the exact prices that it paid, and also gives the exact prices that it received. According to its figures, there was no profiteering, but the profiteering was done by the packers.

Mr. TOWNSEND. May I ask the Senator who is Mr. Weld?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Weld is the agent of one of the packers, so I am informed—I forget which; perhaps all of them, but I think primarily of Swift & Co. I do not know, of course, just how his salary is paid; I do not know anything about that. Mr. Swift has not answered my question on that subject yet. I am merely calling attention to the very marked difference between his testimony and the unquestioned facts as submitted in this advertisement, and showing why Mr. Weld might have thought that when the Sanitary Grocery Co. apologized for having put into his mouth the statement that the Sanitary Grocery Co. and other retailers here in Washington had been selling eggs at 75 and 80 cents a dozen that that cleaned the slate; but the potent fact in these disclosures is that Mr. Weld was trying to show to the Agricultural Committee of the House that the company only received 1 cent profit, when, according to the facts stated in the first advertisement, that are undisputed in the second advertisement—and of course they would have been disputed if they had not been true—and the facts shown by the bills on which payment was made, they received between 5 and 6 cents profit on some eggs. Whether that is an unusual profit, whether that is profiteering, I am not prepared to say, though I think it is, and evidently Mr. Weld thought such a figure was, as he testified the packers only made 1 cent; but I agree with the Senator from Michigan about the desirability of having other facts. We ought to have the packers show us what they are paying the producers for the eggs. If they are wrong about what they sell them for—if they are 4 or 5 cents wrong about what they sell them for, as shown in the facts herein published—it is reasonable to suppose that they may be mistaken as to the amount they paid to the producers of the eggs, and the real facts might double the amount of their profits. The producers should be protected as well as the consumers.

Those are the things that I wish to call to the attention of the Senate to-day. I put these statistics in the RECORD so that Senators may read them and see how fallacious the argument is that it is because of our exports prices are going up this year. The exports have little influence on prices, as these figures show, and can not have an influence on the prices so long as unrestricted, unregulated cold storage is permitted in this country.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I have just listened to the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on the high cost of living. I have in my hand a letter from E. S. Brigham, Commissioner of Agriculture of Vermont, a man of recognized ability, and it seems to me so pertinent to the remarks that have just been made by the Senator from Tennessee that I am going to send it to the desk and ask that it be read. It is only about 20 lines in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the communication.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT,  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Montpelier, August 13, 1913.

Hon. C. S. PAGE,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was somewhat surprised to read the President's address on the high cost of living and to see his announcement that credits and facilities for shipping our wheat abroad would be so controlled that the price of wheat here would be held down.

When the guaranteed minimum price of \$2.26, Chicago basis, was fixed September 2, 1918, the President promised to appoint a commission to investigate the fairness of this price in the spring of 1919 and to make adjustment if conditions warranted. Now that the war is closed, it seems to me an imposition upon the American wheat raiser for the Government to use its powers of manipulating credit and shipping facilities so that the President's guaranteed minimum will become in effect a maximum, and this without any investigation as to whether the present price of wheat yields to the producer a fair return.

I noted also that the President asked Congress for a continuation of the food-control act in time of peace. I served in the Food Administration long enough to secure evidence that the food-control act was used to the great disadvantage of the producer in manipulating prices

in ways which are unknown to the public. It seems to me that the best remedy for the high cost of living is to allow prices of food commodities to rise to the point where farmers can hire labor to produce these commodities in competition with the railroads and other classes of industry. When this is done we may have an increased production, which will solve our problem. On the other hand, if we make conditions such that wages and profits for food producers are below those in any other line of business, we must expect a continuing decreased production, which will eventually result in hunger.

I presume that the administration leaders will present a bill in Congress which will continue the food-control act into peace times, and I believe that if any such measure is passed it should be very carefully drawn, so that a commission of men will not have power to manipulate prices as their fancy may dictate.

Very truly, yours,

E. S. BRIGHAM,  
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has vouched for the ability and integrity of the writer of this letter. The writer strongly arraigns the Food Administration, with which, as I understood the letter, he was for some time associated. In view of his charges, I think this letter should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which is now investigating this subject; and I venture the suggestion that the committee should subpoena this gentleman as a witness, in order that he may give testimony as to the maladministration, if such there was, of the Food Administration and furnish information to aid in determining the important question which is now receiving attention at the hands of the committee.

I therefore move, if a motion is necessary, that the letter be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that course will be pursued.

#### LEASING OF OIL LANDS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2775) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CALDER in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gay	Nelson	Spencer
Bankhead	Hale	New	Sterling
Brandegee	Harris	Norris	Sutherland
Calder	Henderson	Nugent	Swanson
Capper	Hitchcock	Overman	Thomas
Coff	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Townsend
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Page	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	King	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	Kirby	Polindexter	Warren
Fall	La Follette	Ransdell	Watson
Fernald	Lenroot	Sheppard	Welcott
Fletcher	McKellar	Simmons	
France	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	
Frelinghuysen	Myers	Smoot	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, about 12 years ago there was an agitation started in the United States to lease the public lands containing oil, gas, phosphate, sodium, and coal. There has not been a Congress since that time that bills have not been introduced in Congress for the purpose of leasing such public lands.

In the first place, Mr. President, I wish to say that I have been in the past opposed to a leasing system. I have been honest in my opposition to it, because of the fact that I thought that such a policy would not be the best way of developing an increased production of such minerals. I still have that feeling; but, notwithstanding that and knowing the situation as it exists in the United States to-day which has been brought so forcibly to the attention of the country by the recent war, I realize that there must be some change in the policy of our Government respecting public lands that has been in force for the past 12 years.

There are hundreds of millions of acres of the public domain withdrawn from entry of all kinds, and through those withdrawals new development of the natural resources in the western States has practically ceased, and something must be done to change present conditions. Various compromises have been suggested. Bills have been introduced incorporating in them not only the leasing system, but also a system of private ownership in connection with a leasing system. I never have been in favor of that double-headed system. I do not believe it ever would be a success. If we are to develop the public lands of the West, and if we are to begin the exploration and the discovery of these minerals so necessary for the prosperity of our country, legislation must be had, and had at an early date.

It was for that purpose that I introduced, on June 2, 1919, Senate bill 1269, to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain. I have noticed in the

press numbers of references to the bill, all stating that it was a bill following the conference report on the leasing bill that was before this body at the last session of Congress. All such reports, Mr. President, are untrue. The conference report on the bill that was before the Senate at the last session of Congress not only had the leasing system incorporated in it, but it contained a provision that a certain percentage of oil lands obtained through a prospecting permit should be patented to the permittee, and in coal lands it was left discretionary with the Secretary of the Interior whether they were sold outright in case a satisfactory lease could not be obtained. Senate bill 2775 has no such provisions.

Senate bill 1269, introduced by myself, was a bill that was taken up by the Committee on Public Lands for consideration. Amendments were offered to that bill, and when finally completed by the adoption of a number of amendments it was ordered to be reintroduced, which was done by me on August 15, and that print now before the Senate shows the original bill with the amendments agreed to by the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CALDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. KING. I did not quite understand the statement of my colleague with respect to the bill first introduced and which became the basis of the bill under consideration. Was that bill introduced at this session?

Mr. SMOOT. It was introduced by me on June 2, 1919. I will say to the Senator that there were a number of amendments to that bill adopted by the committee, and they are incorporated in Senate bill 2775.

Mr. KING. As I recall, there was a measure agreed upon at the last session of Congress by the conferees after it had been held in conference for a number of months. I have had no opportunity to compare the present measure with the one which was then agreed upon. Is there any substantial difference between this bill and that one?

Mr. SMOOT. The difference is that Senate bill 2775 is purely a leasing measure, while—

Mr. KING. If my colleague will still pardon me, the bill agreed upon at the last session was a leasing bill; but there was a provision in it that title could be acquired to a portion of the lands that were covered by the permits or by the leases.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, and I thought I had made that plain in the statement I made a few moments ago. There is no title under the pending bill acquired to any portion of the public lands containing the numerals named in the bill. A lease only can be obtained.

Mr. KING. Would it interrupt my colleague if I should make a further inquiry?

Mr. SMOOT. Not in the least.

Mr. KING. I regret very much that this bill does not contain the provision to which reference has just been made. While I am opposed to this bill, and while I was opposed to the bill which was agreed upon at the last session, because I am absolutely opposed to the leasing system, the paternalism, the bureaucracy, the autocracy, the un-American system that the leasing system entails, nevertheless there was a provision in that bill that permitted the acquisition of title to a portion of the leased ground. Was there any good reason why that provision, which was a sort of a cure for some of the follies of the bill, and vindicated it somewhat, should not be included in this bill?

Mr. SMOOT. The only reasons I know of are that members of the committee thought that double-headed system of handling the public lands would prove a failure, and others believed that the public lands containing the minerals covered in this bill should never pass out of the control and ownership of the Government. As far as I am concerned, as I stated, I would prefer either one system or the other, and I will say to my colleague that that is the reason why I introduced the bill as a straight leasing proposition.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. One very good reason, among many others, why title should not be conveyed is that with a full title conveyed there could be no supervision over the operation of the wells. A single well in a producing oil field, if not properly cared for so as to prevent water from getting into the oil sands, may destroy an entire field; and with full title granted there could be no way of preventing that kind of a catastrophe in a field.

Mr. KING. If my colleague will permit me, of course the argument the Senator has just made is an argument against the alienation of any oil lands by the Government.

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.



Mr. KING. And I do not think that argument is one which is sound; I do not think it is one which ought to prevail in determining the policy of the Government with respect to its public lands. As I said, I believe in the alienation of the public lands. I think they ought to be gotten out into the hands of individuals. Private ownership is the basis of the prosperity of the American people. The other system is alien to democratic institutions and to our form of Government. I think it is pernicious.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment. In a letter dated July 29, 1919, from the Secretary of the Interior to me upon this subject the Secretary makes the following statement:

Senate bill 1269 is purely a leasing measure, containing no provision for patents except upon valid claims initiated prior to withdrawal and maintained in full compliance with existing law. Although I originally suggested the giving of a patent to prospectors of a part of the land upon which discoveries have been made, thinking it would be an incentive to exploration, I am now convinced, after mature consideration, that a straight leasing measure should be enacted, and I find that is the desire of people interested in mineral development generally.

Mr. President, I have lived with this legislation, as it were, for nearly 10 years. I am in close touch, not only with the men producing oil to-day, but I have been in close touch with the men who desire to go upon the public domain and prospect for oil and take their chances in discovering oil; but all known oil lands have been tied up by withdrawals for many years past and prospecting upon public lands has been limited indeed. I think now without a moment's hesitation I can truthfully state that there are at least 95 per cent of all the men who have been interested in this subject and who are bitterly opposed to the leasing system, as I was and as I am, are to-day saying that under the situation as it exists in the country the best thing to do is to try a leasing system, and the best plan is to prepare a bill along the line that will best meet the situation; and that is what I have tried to do.

Mr. THOMAS. Does not the Senator think it is the only thing to do in view of the later decisions of the Supreme Court?

Mr. SMOOT. I think so, Mr. President, and particularly with the power, I was going to say, of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretaries of the different departments to prevent action upon any kind of bill that may be presented to Congress unless it provides a leasing system and to their liking.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. By the kindness of the Senator from Utah, I wish to say a word with reference to a remark made just a moment ago by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. I desire to say to the Senator from Utah that there are quite a number of Senators here on both sides of the Chamber who sympathize very keenly with the feeling he has expressed, and they have repeatedly expressed themselves similarly during the course of a long struggle extending now over a period of six years to my knowledge, with this matter now before the Senate. But I desire to remind the Senator from Utah that there is growing up a sentiment, embryonic as yet I hope, that no disposition whatever should be made of the public lands containing these valuable mineral deposits, either by alienation or by lease; that they ought to be reserved altogether and be prospected and developed and operated by the Government, a plan of disposition which I apprehend would be even more objectionable to the Senator from Utah, if I have correctly estimated his views.

A great many of us have felt compelled, with reference to this legislation, to yield something of our own views concerning what ought to be done in order to secure some development of these lands, and I suggest to the Senator that by opposing this measure he is serving the purpose of those who do not want any legislation on this subject at all, in the hope that the sentiment of which I have spoken will grow and develop until it will be impossible to get legislation of this character or of the character which he thinks ought to be enacted.

Mr. SMOOT. In this connection I wish to say, if the reports that come to me are true, it would not surprise me to have this administration make, before this bill becomes a law, a recommendation that all coal upon the public domain and the operation of oil wells, including those that are in operation to-day and those that are yet to be discovered, be operated by the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator from Utah about section 1 of the bill. It is limited apparently to citizens

of the United States, and the statement is made that no alien shall ever be permitted to own any interest. Merely by way of suggestion, I should like to know from the Senator what effect he thinks that would have on our citizens in certain South American countries and in Mexico, and ought there not to be some limitation on that matter? I simply throw it out as a suggestion. I have not thought it out myself.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from Tennessee will allow me to proceed, I assure him that that provision of the bill will be discussed at some length, and I prefer to discuss it later. I might state that I agree with the Senator that there is great apprehension expressed by Senators, and the committee had some misgiving as to just what effect that provision of the bill is going to have upon foreign countries. It is a question as to what is the best policy to pursue.

The committee decided ultimately that it is the best policy to follow the course as outlined in the last paragraph of section 1. But, as I said, that will be discussed later when we reach it.

Mr. President, there are withdrawn from all development 6,500,000 acres of the public domain supposed to contain oil, or, in other words, designated as oil lands. There are 2,700,000 acres of phosphate lands withdrawn in the same way. There are 3,500,000 acres of oil-shale lands that have already been classified. There are 43,700,000 acres of coal lands withdrawn, and of those 43,700,000 acres the Government up to the present time has classified as coal lands only 27,300,000 acres. That vast acreage of the public domain, all situated in the western part of our country, has been tied up for years, preventing any form of development. No development upon these lands can be made to-day. The time has come, in the opinion of the Committee on Public Lands, that legislation must be passed in order that these great undeveloped resources of our country shall be made use of by the American people.

When I was told 12 years ago that such withdrawals would be made, and that no development upon these lands should be allowed until the western Senators had agreed to a leasing system, I doubted at that time whether the program would be carried out. It has been carried out, and to-day we find that there is an actual scarcity of some of the minerals enumerated in the pending bill. I say now that unless there is a change in policy and the development of the lands for the minerals begins at an early time it will cost the American people millions of dollars and perhaps the loss of a great portion of their foreign commerce.

In all of the other leasing bills that have been reported favorably to the Senate by the Committee on Public Lands, the provisions of the bill applied to the Grand Canyon National Park and to the Mount Olympus National Monument. The committee thought that the park and the monument ought to be eliminated from the bill. There was opposition to such action, but the reason given that appealed to the committee was that the initiation of mineral claims had been used as a cloak to interfere with the full and free use of the park by the public. That has reference more particularly to the Grand Canyon National Park. Your committee thought that if coal indications were such in the Grand Canyon National Park as to justify prospecting for it, legislation could be passed covering that particular park, and so with the Mount Olympus Monument. It was for those reasons, Mr. President, that the committee decided to strike them out from Senate bill 1269.

There is a provision in section 1 of the bill referred to by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], found on page 2 of the bill, that has never yet appeared in any leasing bill offered in the Senate or reported out from a committee of the Senate or voted on by either House. That provision is as follows:

*Provided, That no alien shall, by stock ownership or otherwise, own any interest in a lease acquired under the provisions of this act, except as hereinafter provided, and all certificates for stock hereafter issued in any corporation having such a lease shall specifically and clearly show this provision on the face thereof.*

There are very few Senators in the Chamber at the present time, Mr. President, and I know a number of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are interested in this provision of the bill, so I would prefer now to pass it over until they are present and then discuss the question when there is a motion to strike it out or the question is brought up by one of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee. That will save a discussion of the provision twice.

I will say, however, in passing, that this proviso was not put in the bill without the most serious consideration. It was not incorporated in the measure without knowing the seriousness of it, and also without knowing that unless it is incorporated in the law the result will be serious to our own country and its control of the oil produced in it. All men know

that the control of the oil in a country means a control of the commerce of that country.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NUGENT. If that be true, I should like to have the Senator explain why it is not possible for the Government itself to retain control of what remains of the oil lands of the country, in order that the oil of the Nation of the future may not be controlled by the representatives of other Governments.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not in favor of any such a system or policy. It may become necessary when the country can consume all the oil produced, but even then it would be unwise, in my opinion. I will say to the Senate that the provision under discussion ought to be made immediately, in order that the oils that are left remaining in the public lands owned by the United States should be controlled by the Government of the United States in case of necessity.

I take it for granted, Mr. President, that the greatest interest in this legislation revolves around the oil and gas lands of our country. In all the bills that have been reported in the past there has been a provision that would allow permits for the exploration for oil within a known geologic structure, and in most of the bills that have been reported heretofore the royalties have been the same whether the permittee developed the oil outside of a known geologic structure or within one. Your committee thought that that was unfair. The wildcatter, so called, is generally the man who goes out and discovers a new oil field. He is the one who, in many cases, goes outside of the known geologic structure, spends all the money he has and all he can borrow or beg in order to drive a well to a depth where he thinks oil will be found. He is the pioneer, as it were. Your committee thought the royalty that would be charged to him should be less than the royalty that would be charged to the man who under the original bill would be allowed and permitted to prospect for oil within a known geologic structure.

So, Mr. President, we decided to strike out from Senate bill 1269 all rights for permits within a known geologic structure, because within that structure, and they are generally small in area, the man who gets a permit knows that within such a structure oil is being produced, and if he wants to go within one of those structures he ought to take a lease and not a permit, and that is what the pending bill provides for, with a different rate of royalty.

In other words, if a person desires a permit to prospect for oil on 2,560 acres of the public domain outside of a geologic structure, he has the right to claim one-quarter of 2,560 acres, if he discovers oil, at a royalty of 5 per cent instead of 12½ per cent. Then he is given a preference right to the other three-fourths of that amount, if he so desires, at the regular royalty of not less than 12½ per cent or more than 25 per cent.

Unless there is some misunderstanding as to the provisions of the bill or some Senator desires to ask questions in reference to it, I am not going into a discussion of each section of the bill, but I do desire to call attention to section 35, on page 31, which reads:

That all royalty accruing to the United States under any oil or gas lease or permit under this act on demand of the Secretary of the Interior shall be paid in oil or gas.

Then follows, on page 33, beginning with line 1 and ending with line 21, a provision that has for its object the granting to the Secretary of the Interior the power to sell the royalty oil collected within a district or within any number of districts to the highest bidder; but all of the bidding is to be in his hands and bids may be rejected or accepted. I desire briefly to say that the purpose of this portion of the bill is to assist the independent operation of refineries; in other words, small producers, within a known geologic structure or in a known oil or gas field may combine, if it is thought best, and bid for the royalty oil, and the Secretary of the Interior will have it within his power to dispose of all of the royalty oil, not only that from the individual producers of oil, but, for example, from the Mid-West Oil Co., the large producer in the Wyoming field, or from the large producer in any oil field who has sufficient capital to erect a refinery and has it in operation. The small operators, unless they can purchase sufficient oil, no matter whether they could get money to put up a refinery or not, would find themselves short of oil to successfully operate a refinery and make the operation profitable.

Under this provision of the bill the Secretary of the Interior can see that the small producer has a chance at all of the royalty oil of the district, thus insuring oil sufficient to operate an independent refinery. There will be opposition in bidding

for the oil between the owners of the refinery operating to-day and a refinery that can be operated under the provisions of this bill. As the bill was reported to the Senate it read as follows:

Upon granting any oil or gas lease under this act and at the beginning of each five-year period thereafter during said lease, the Secretary of the Interior shall offer for sale, upon notice and advertisement on sealed bids or at public auction, all royalty oil and gas accruing or reserved to the United States under such lease.

It was brought to the attention of the committee after they adopted that provision that it was unworkable. In fact, Mr. Mr. President, it is somewhat strange that members of the committee did not see that it was unworkable before they adopted the provision; but I will state that it was the last day we had the bill under consideration; and it was about 20 minutes to 12 o'clock, at which hour the Senate met, when we took up the question for consideration. We were all in favor of the principle and we did not study the effect of the provision as we should have done. So, on yesterday, I moved to strike out lines 1, 2, 3, and the first word in line 4, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

The Secretary of the Interior shall have the right to offer for sale, for periods of not exceeding five years—

So as to read:

The Secretary of the Interior shall have the right to offer for sale, for periods of not exceeding five years, upon notice and advertisement—

And so forth.

Mr. WARREN. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment is on page 32.

The original wording required the Secretary of the Interior to advertise for the sale of oil for a period of five years.

There is no product of which I am aware that has fluctuated in value as has oil, for within the last five years the price of oil per barrel has run all the way from 26 cents a barrel up to \$2.25, which is the price to-day. It would be unjust to the Government, and it would also be unjust to the man who bid upon the oil to compel either to make a bid or accept one that would cover a period of five years.

Mr. President, with oil at \$2.25 per barrel to-day, what set of men who undertook to build a refining plant would like to offer \$2.25 a barrel for oil—the highest price known—and be compelled to pay that price during the whole term of five years? Of course it is apparent upon its face that no such provision could work satisfactorily either to the Government or to the individual.

On the other hand, if oil were 26 cents a barrel to-day, how unfair it would be to the Government of the United States to ask for bids, which perhaps, when received, might be 2 cents or 5 cents or 10 cents a barrel higher than the market price. It would be very unfair for the Government of the United States to tie up its product for the full period of five years. The amendment that has been made to the bill simply states that—

The Secretary of the Interior shall have the right to offer for sale for periods of not exceeding five years.

I admit that this grants to the Secretary of the Interior the power to sell the oil for a period of 4 years 11 months and 29 days, but I do not believe there will ever be a Secretary of the Interior who will tie up the oil royalty which belongs to the Government of the United States for any such period.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENDRICK. Does the Senator from Utah not see in that amendment a weakening of the mandatory power to sell the royalty oil?

Mr. SMOOT. The only difference is that this amendment provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall have the right to offer it for sale, while the provision as drawn by Mr. Swartz says:

The Secretary of the Interior shall offer for sale.

Mr. KENDRICK. Would the Senator not accept this as a substitute for the amendment already adopted:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell for periods of not more than five years?

Mr. SMOOT. No; that is nearly what the original provision proposed to do. The original provision read:

Upon granting any oil or gas lease under this act, and at the beginning of each five-year period thereafter during said lease—

The wording of the amendment suggested by the Senator is not exactly the same, because his proposed amendment says "not more than five years." The Senator does not change by his suggestion, however, the objections to the provision as it was originally reported to the Senate.



Mr. KENDRICK. The difficulty about the amendment which has been made, as I see it, is that it leaves it discretionary with the Secretary of the Interior as to whether or not he shall sell the royalty oil at all.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true; and not only that, but the original provision reads:

Such advertisement and sale shall reserve to the Secretary of the Interior the right to reject all bids and the right to require redelivery of the actual oil or gas or any refined product thereof whenever within his judgment the interest of the United States demands.

That same provision remains in the bill under the amendment which was accepted yesterday.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator from Wyoming will permit me, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Utah what the purpose was in changing the language of the bill which required the Secretary of the Interior to sell the royalty oil, making the duty imperative upon him, to a provision that he shall have the right to sell, leaving in him a discretion as to whether he shall sell or not?

Mr. SMOOT. The committee thought after reading the criticism of Mr. Phelan, of the Shipping Board, that it ought to be left discretionary with the Secretary.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is what I want to know—if that is the purpose?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will wait for just a moment, I will read what Mr. Phelan said. I have his statement here. Referring to lines 1 to 21—that is the whole of the provision—Mr. Phelan says:

This part of section 35 is preposterous, and by no system of reasoning can it be made workable. Probably no commodity in the world fluctuates as much in price as crude petroleum. Taking the mid-continent field as an illustration, it appears that the price of crude petroleum has fluctuated during the past five years from 40 cents to \$2.25 per barrel. The maximum price is being paid at present, and the average price has been less than \$1.25 per barrel. In 1914-15, when the Cushing field was at its height, the market price of crude petroleum was 40 cents per barrel, while contracts were made as low as 26 cents. To expect the purchaser of oil to bind himself to pay a fixed price for crude oil for a five-year period is unthinkable, and to expect the producer to bind himself to sell oil for the same period of time at a contract price is just as unreasonable.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I thoroughly appreciate that, and therefore I can appreciate very well an amendment which would permit the Secretary to sell the royalty oil for a period of five years or for some less period, leaving it to him to fix the period, but that is not the change made.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand it is not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The change authorizes him to sell or not to sell as he sees fit. Let me inquire of the Senator if the Secretary concludes not to sell, what would he do with the oil?

Mr. SMOOT. No Secretary of the Interior will conclude not to sell unless it is to the advantage of the Government of the United States that he should do so. It might result in great disadvantage to the United States if the Secretary were compelled to sell. The Senator from Wyoming will admit that even in the Wyoming fields whenever there has been talk of beginning the construction and the operation of a refinery something has happened somehow which has prevented carrying out the project.

I think I know what did happen, and I think the Senator from Wyoming knows what happened, and I wish to say that the Secretary of the Interior, whoever he may be, ought to have the right to say whether he shall sell the oil produced as royalty or whether it shall be taken by the Government for its own use. Mind you, that is one thing which it is desired to bring about. Suppose the Navy wanted the royalty oil that is produced in the Wyoming district, and suppose the law said that the Secretary should sell it through bidding. In that case the Government would lose the royalty oil from that district.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator will permit me, I am not speaking in criticism of the change made at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I recognize that.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I merely want to understand the significance of it. It gives the Secretary the right to sell or not to sell as he sees fit.

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. So I inquire of the Senator if the Secretary of the Interior does not make provision for sale, what will he do with the oil? He can now offer to sell the royalty oil—and I think the bill ought to give him permission to sell the royalty oil for the entire period of five years or for a less period if he desires to do so, for a year, for instance, and leave it for disposition again at the end of the year—but suppose he concludes not to sell, has provision been made for the storage of the royalty oil?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Navy Department might want to store the oil, and the Secretary of the Interior is granted the right to demand the royalty shall be paid either in oil or money. The royalty as fixed is 12½ per cent of the value or of the oil. If the Government of the United States wants the oil, it will take the oil as provided in section 35, which reads in part:

That all royalty accruing to the United States under any oil or gas lease or permit under this act on demand of the Secretary of the Interior shall be paid in oil or gas.

The Secretary of the Navy thinks there will be a time—and no doubt there will be—and the Shipping Board particularly believes that the time is now at hand when the Secretary of the Interior ought to say, "I do not want the money; I want the oil." In that event, of course, the Government would take the oil and provide storage for it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am in full accord with that idea.

Mr. SMOOT. Under the amendment suggested by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] the Secretary will be compelled to sell the oil. We do not want that; we want him to have the privilege of selling or of keeping the oil.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course I am in entire accord with that idea, but what troubled me was that the language does not seem to meet the case. It seems to me it should provide that he shall have the right to sell the royalty oil for a period of five years or less than five years, in his discretion, and then it should provide what disposition should be made of the royalty oil in case he concludes not to sell it.

Mr. SMOOT. It will all be sold, Mr. President, unless the Government wishes to store it, and the Government itself will make provision for the storage—there is no doubt about that—if they wish to retain the oil.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that I understand very well the conditions which have prevailed in my State, to which he has referred. The experience we have had there is what prompts me now to seek to place in this bill such a provision as will compel action along different lines from those which have been followed in the past. I am perfectly willing to see incorporated in the bill a limitation or restriction that, in case the oil is not required by the United States Government, it shall be sold from time to time in periods not to exceed five years.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the situation in Wyoming after this bill goes into operation will be quite different than it ever has been in the past. The Government will take at least 12½ per cent, and it would not surprise me at all if it took 20 per cent, of the oil produced in the whole State, and it has the disposition of that oil. Now, I have no doubt that if the independent producers of Wyoming want to erect a refinery, the Secretary of the Interior—I do not care who he may be—would prefer to sell the royalty oil to them rather than to anybody else, and that would encourage them at least to the extent that they would have a reasonable chance of securing the oil that is paid as royalty to the Government of the United States within the district.

Mr. KENDRICK. Assuming that that is so, I see no reason why we should not provide in the bill that he shall follow the course that we clearly intend him to take.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, if we make it that he shall sell it, then suppose the Government wanted to take the oil and ship it out of Wyoming?

Mr. KENDRICK. As I said a moment ago, I am perfectly willing to leave that provision.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the whole provision covers it, because, as the Senator will see if he will read the whole of the provision, I think it is left in the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. KENDRICK. I have read it carefully, Mr. President, and I will say this about it: There has been a really serious condition in my State for many years. Our oil has been bringing one-half the price that has obtained in other sections of the country. The plan of this amendment—to sell this royalty oil—is clearly to correct that condition. I agree to the necessary change in so far as a limitation of time is concerned; but we ought not to leave in the law any obscure language that would leave the duty of the Secretary of the Interior in doubt.

Mr. SMOOT. That is why I do not want to leave it. I want it distinctly understood that the Secretary of the Interior shall have the discretion as to whether it shall be sold, or whether it shall be paid in oil and the Government retain that oil. We can not do otherwise than that.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will bear with me just a moment, this question was brought to the attention of the committee by Mr. Swartz, the representative of the independent oil producers of Wyoming. As it was reported to the Senate, it was as agreed to by Mr. Swartz; but I need not go over the

same ground again, because it is unworkable in its original form. It did say there that "the Secretary of the Interior shall offer for sale," but it also continued by giving him the discretionary power as to whether he would accept the bid or reject it. All we say now is this: Instead of compelling him to sell all of the oil for a five-year period, because it was to be sold in five-year periods, we simply say: "The Secretary of the Interior shall have the right to offer for sale, for periods of not exceeding five years," and it does not change a word in the balance of the provision.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield—

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. KING. It seems to me that the point for which the committee and the chairman of the committee are contending—namely, that there ought to be discretion, because if you make it mandatory it might preclude the disposition of the oil to the Government—is not quite sound. If the Government desires to purchase—that is, the Navy Department or the Shipping Board—for governmental use, the sale could be effectuated just the same. It is a question of bookkeeping. One department of the Government sells to another agency or department of the Government; and if there is a provision that the Secretary shall sell, he may sell to the Navy Department; he may sell to the Government; he may sell upon a sliding scale; the sale may be for five years, graduated upon the market price—5 per cent below, or 1 per cent below, or the market price—and in that way the Government could get it, and it would be a sale. So that if the contention of the Senator is that if you have this mandatory provision in the bill it will inhibit the Government from purchasing it, it does not seem to me that that is quite correct.

Mr. SMOOT. I think my colleague has not really thought how that would be brought about. The Government of the United States under the law has to ask for bids for everything that it purchases, and each bidder has to submit his bids; and the lowest bid, if it is a reliable party, is generally taken. I do not see how they can go to work under this provision and have the Government offer to sell the Government so much oil. Not only that, but this oil when it is produced has to be handled quickly or else there has to be a storage capacity for it.

Take the production, for instance, of last month in the United States. The production in the month of June was 31,239,000 barrels. There was a daily production of 1,041,300 barrels. Now, there has to be some way of handling it, and handling it quickly. You can not stop its flow and you have to take the oil as it comes and handle it as best you can. I think the provision that we have here now will take care of the Wyoming situation and any other great oil field that may be developed on the public lands of the United States.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me for just a moment, I appreciate the statute to which the Senator refers, and of course if the policy I suggested were carried out there would have to be a proper amendment permitting the purchase by some agency of the Government other than by advertising or under the general advertising provisions of the statute, but I am very much averse to the pursuit of any policy that will entail upon the Interior Department the obligation or the duty or the necessity of erecting immense storage reservoirs for the conservation of the oil. The cost will be enormous—indeed, perhaps prohibitive. I think the Secretary ought to have discretion to sell, but there ought to be, perhaps, some limitation concerning the exercise of that discretion.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that that never will happen with any Secretary of the Interior, unless it becomes absolutely necessary in order to store the oil for our Navy or the shipping that we may operate in the future.

Mr. KING. I would prefer that the Navy Department or the Shipping Board provide the storage rather than the Interior Department.

Mr. SMOOT. That will be taken care of, of course, by the Secretary of the Interior. If the Navy Department makes a demand upon the Secretary of the Interior for this oil there is not any question but that the Secretary of the Interior will deliver it and at the place that the Secretary of the Navy may designate, and the Secretary of the Navy will have to provide storage capacity for it.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator's pardon for interrupting him again.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. KENDRICK. I want to say that I am apprehensive for an entirely different reason than that expressed by the Senator from Utah. We have had a condition in our State, which has already been referred to, in regard to the way the refining has been done, and I am apprehensive lest this oil will continue to pass into the hands of refineries without being sold to the highest bidder.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, well, this bill provides that it shall be sold to the highest bidder.

Mr. KENDRICK. I am concerned to see that neither the Secretary nor any one else in authority has any discretion as to that.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that this bill provides that the oil shall be sold to the highest bidder. We could not get through Congress in a thousand years a law saying that the Secretary of the Interior should sell it to John Smith or any particular person. The only form in which we could ever get it through Congress is that it should be sold to the highest bidder, and the independent refiners will have to take their chances on that; but it does give them a chance of getting the oil in order to run an independent refinery.

Mr. KENDRICK. But, as I read the bill, it grants authority to the Secretary of the Interior to sell; it gives him the right to sell, but does not provide that he shall sell. Therein lies the only difference between the Senator from Utah and myself.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I understand that, and I have tried in my simple way of speaking to indicate that I think the Secretary ought to be given that discretion. I think if we compel him to sell it, the oil may be forced upon the market at a time when it would be against the interests of the Government of the United States to sell it. It would either be that way, or else they would have to provide some method of storage. Now, we are not sure that these independent people will build refineries. We can not say as to that. I hope they will, and I will say to the Senator now that this provision never would be in this bill at all if it were not with the hope that the independent refiners will build a plant there and refine their own oil.

Mr. KENDRICK. There is no doubt that that was the spirit in which it was put in.

I will ask the Senator from Utah whether he expects to conclude the consideration of this bill this afternoon?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; I do not think it can pass this evening. I have no intention of forcing it through this evening. I should like to get as far along with the consideration of the bill as possible; but if the Senator desires to have it go over until to-morrow, and consider that question again, I am perfectly willing that it should. I do want to give notice, however, that unless there is some good reason to the contrary, I should like to see the bill passed to-morrow. I do not think there are very many Senators who desire to speak upon it.

I want to say that I never expected to get out of the Public Lands Committee, with a unanimous report, a leasing bill. I never expected to vote, as a member of that committee, for a straight leasing bill with the provisions that are in this bill; but I have stated why I did so, and I am perfectly willing to rest upon that statement.

In order that it may hasten the passage of the bill I am going to say nothing more about its provisions unless somebody desires to ask some question.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, before the Senator quits this particular provision which has been the subject of consideration, I should like to make a few suggestions in the hope that the idea we all entertain may be clearly expressed in it. I suppose probably the matter has had serious consideration from the committee; but I venture the opinion that the last proviso at the end of section 35, on page 32, is of the most questionable nature.

Touching this matter of the disposition of the royalty oil, evidently the idea is that the Secretary of the Interior ought to have the right to offer the royalty oil for sale, and for sale for periods of five years or less than five years, as in his discretion may seem wise; that he ought to have liberty in that direction; likewise, Mr. President, that he ought to have the right in his discretion not to sell the royalty oil at all, but to keep it for the use of the United States. With some circumspection the idea might be expressed more briefly; but that, I think, is the idea that is in the minds of the framers of the legislation, and it meets my entire approval. I am very sure, however, that the language suggested here by way of amendment does not answer that purpose at all.

I suggest, for the consideration of the chairman of the committee, that he take out in line 2 the language "at the beginning of each five-year period," and insert in lieu thereof "from time to time," and after the word "shall" in line 3 insert "except whenever in his judgment it is desirable to retain the same for the use of the United States," so that it would read—

Upon granting any oil or gas lease under this act and from time to time thereafter during said lease, the Secretary of the Interior shall, except whenever in his judgment it is desirable to retain the same for the use of the United States, offer for sale, upon notice and advertisement—

And so forth.



Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will submit that amendment, I shall be very glad to think it over during the evening.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I shall be glad to do that. If the Senator will give attention now to the concluding proviso, that section provides, as will be noticed—

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield at that point? Has the Senator from Montana the amendment before him that was adopted yesterday?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator was reading, it seemed to me, from the bill as it was reported.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I did read from the bill as reported, but I have in mind the amendment that was offered yesterday. However, I was endeavoring to convey to the Senate the idea that the amendment which was offered yesterday does not, at least clearly, express the idea that apparently everyone has in mind.

Section 35 provides very properly that the Secretary should offer the royalty oil for sale unless in his judgment and discretion it seemed to be desirable to keep it for the use of the United States, and very appropriate provisions are put in that he may reject any and all bids, and so on. But now comes the provision as follows:

*Provided, however.* That advertisement or sale as herein required may be dispensed with in specific cases upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior that such course is in the interest of the public good.

In other words, whenever the Secretary of the Interior finds that it is in the interest of the public good, he does not need to advertise at all. The representative of the Standard Oil Co. may go down to the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and they will have a private confab about it, and the Secretary of the Interior will reach the conclusion that it is for the public good to make a private arrangement with the representatives of the Standard Oil Co. by which they would take this royalty oil. I am sure the committee did not intend to leave open opportunities of that character.

I have been advised by a gentleman of my neighboring State of Wyoming, in whom I have the very greatest confidence, that the provision was inserted at his suggestion and for a very commendable purpose. He said he had in mind that there would be some small independent refiners or a group of producers who would establish a refinery, and adjacent to their property there would be other property that would be leased by the Government of the United States, and they would thus be able, perhaps, to make an arrangement with the Secretary of the Interior by which they could get the royalty oil which, together with their own, would enable them to carry on a small refining establishment. Of course, that is a very good purpose to be subserved, but I submit that it is too dangerous a power to put in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the enormous quantity of royalty oil, which as we hope will come into his hands, without even giving competitors an opportunity to bid on it, not even advertising it for sale. I think that the provision ought to come out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair make inquiry of the Senator from Utah as to the wording of the bill in the proviso to which the Senator from Montana just called attention. Did the committee intend to report it out to read as it does in lines 18 and 19, page 32, "advertisement or sale"? Is it "or" or "for"?

Mr. SMOOT. It should be "for."

I want to say at this point, Mr. President, that I do not want to unduly criticize the Government Printing Office for the many typographical errors in the bill. I introduced the bill one morning, and I told the Government Printing Office that I wanted it back here in half an hour, as I was instructed by the Committee on Public Lands to make a report from that committee upon the bill that day. Really, I want to apologize. This is not the only error; there are quite a number of them in the bill; but it is perhaps my fault, because I gave the Public Printer only a half hour to get the bill from the press to the Senate.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The word "or," as suggested by the Chair should be "for"?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course that makes no difference in my argument. The proviso authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, practically in his discretion, to dispense with advertisement altogether.

Mr. SMOOT. What the Senator from Montana says is absolutely correct. All the apprehension that he has about this provision could be realized; but, Mr. President, I think it would be better to be very frank in this matter and simply say why

this was done. That is the only way I know of discussing the question.

There might be a case like this: A lease to a citizen of a well that was producing, say, after three months or six months not to exceed five barrels a day. The royalty on that at not more than 12½ per cent would be so small that if it were all put together for five months it would amount to such a small quantity of oil that it would hardly be just for him to go to the expense of advertising, and so forth. That is one instance.

Let me state another. The provision is written with the distinct understanding that it is for the advantage of the small producers in an oil field who might desire to construct a refinery. They felt that if they undertook to erect a refinery and the present refiners decided that they would bid on the oil more than it was actually worth in order to prevent these individuals from receiving the necessary oil to run or operate their refinery, they could do it. This simply says to the Secretary of the Interior that if such a condition arises you need not advertise, but you know what the value of this oil is and you may sell it to those individuals and let them operate that refinery without advertising. I want to say frankly to the Senator that is what the people of Wyoming had in mind and that is what the committee had in mind when they allowed that provision to go in. Every word the Senator from Montana says is true. Legislation of that kind is not satisfactory legislation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me suggest to the Senator from Utah that we see if we can not meet the expectations of these people, so far as they are just, without exposing the administration of the bill to the worst kind of scandals and the Government of the United States to the most egregious frauds. The reason first—

Mr. SMOOT. May I say to the Senator that I would like very much if he would, this afternoon or evening some time, draw up what he thinks would be a proper provision to cover as nearly as possible the case as I have outlined it. There is no pride in the wording of the bill on the part of any member of the committee. What they want to do, now that they have made up their minds to a leasing bill, is to get the best measure possible and to hamper the development of the western country just as little as possible.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I will be very glad to be helpful in any way I can.

I desire to suggest in this connection that the reason assigned in the first place, that it would be expensive and perhaps unprofitable to advertise where the production was small, could be overcome by a provision that in all cases where the production does not exceed five barrels per day advertisement may be dispensed with. But with respect to the second suggestion, I think it will not be necessary for me to do anything because the bill, as it reads, provides that—

In cases where no satisfactory bid is received or where the accepted bidder fails to complete the purchase, the Secretary of the Interior within his discretion may readvertise such royalty for sale or sell at private sale.

And so forth.

So the Secretary of the Interior becomes the absolute judge as to whether the bid is satisfactory. I apprehend that that would include the bidder, and if he finds the bidder to be one who has a practical monopoly in the field, or if it becomes desirable to shut out a large producer and give an opportunity to the lesser bidders he could reject the one bid and thus give the preference which it is proposed to give by the proviso.

Mr. LENROOT. What would the Senator suggest should be done in the case of a discovery of a very large production where the Secretary does not care to take the oil? Under the provisions of the bill without the proviso he would not be permitted to sell without advertisement. It would be very essential that he should be permitted to sell at private sale until advertisement can be had and bids received.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Undoubtedly provision should be made for that.

Mr. LENROOT. Without the proviso he would not have that right under the terms of the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That, it seems to me, is the case under the bill as it stands.

Mr. LENROOT. No; the proviso would permit him to sell in that kind of a case.

Mr. SMOOT. The balance of the provision requires advertisement, but after advertisement, then, of course, he can sell at private sale.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I did not have any idea that the proviso referred to the interim between the bringing in of the well and the completion of the advertisement.

Mr. LENROOT. It covers that kind of a case.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Undoubtedly, that should be taken care of.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think this is all I have to say in relation to the bill at the present time.

On the conclusion of Mr. Smoot's speech,

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether there is any other Senator who desires to speak upon the bill to-night or not. Does the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] desire to speak on the bill to-night?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do not. I do not intend to speak on the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. If there is no other Senator who desires to speak on the bill at this time, I shall move an adjournment.

#### INTERNATIONAL BANKING SITUATION.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I wish to have placed in the RECORD a letter which I wrote to the President on July 16 and also one which I wrote August 18 relative to the international banking situation.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 16, 1919.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Europe needs supplies from the United States to restore the productive powers of Europe to prewar conditions, to enable Europe to pay its debts to America, to stop the growing discontent of unemployed men, and to check the growth of Bolshevism.

America has the supplies abundantly available.

Europe requires credit to buy these things.

The Secretary of the Treasury does not approve the extension of further credits by the United States Government to cover European purchases. I believe that the American people would approve the extension of these credits properly safeguarded if it were explained to them—that the credits would open a way to market their goods at satisfactory prices.

I understand that Holland, for instance, is now extending governmental credits to France for such peace purposes; that Sweden is also doing the same thing; and that some of the South American Republics have the same matter under advisement. The urgency is great, and this policy would be of benefit to both buyer and seller.

We have an investing public in America, however, well suited to extend these credits to Europe by buying European securities. There is needed a mechanism qualified to pass upon the validity of European securities offered for sale to the investing public. These securities consist of "promises to pay" of private merchants, of syndicates, of underwriting banks, and of bonds of European municipalities and nations and of combinations of such securities.

Against these securities, properly selected, debentures could be issued by American corporations and sold to the American investing public on a 6 per cent basis, provided the Government of the United States would lend its good offices in granting a suitable charter or charters to such institutions, with governmental supervision, the charter rights to be exercised under governmental patronage and favor.

Unless immediate steps are taken to accomplish these results, I fear a serious business reaction will take place in the United States by cutting off a large part of our foreign market for our surplus products, throwing these products back on the United States and causing a very serious recession of prices due to overproduction. I agree that prices should come down, but the reduction should be by the elimination of excess profits artificially placed upon goods, and they should not come down by cutting down the wages paid to labor. There is a natural increase in prices in the United States due to the expansion of our currency by excess gold imports and by the development of Federal reserve notes against commodities which have taken the place of gold as a basis of note issue.

With a view to providing a mechanism for accomplishing these purposes, I introduced on February 20, 1918, a bill (S. 3928) to establish a Federal reserve foreign bank. (Copy inclosed.)

You referred this bill to the Comptroller of the Currency for a report and he made you a favorable report, but you took no action upon it, as far as I know, and I was unable to get the support of the Treasury Department for the bill, and it died with the Sixty-fifth Congress, to my great regret.

I drew up a bill some months ago providing for the organization of a large corporation, with a billion dollars of capital, to handle these European securities, issue debenture bonds, and

provide the means of marketing European securities in America with the investing public, a copy of which I enclose.

The virtue of this bill consisted in the Government of the United States having a very substantial interest in it, and therefore being in a position, from the standpoint of the public, to protect the interests of the public as well as the interest of the stockholders, who might otherwise deal too largely from a selfish standpoint.

The New York banks dealing in foreign exchange have been hostile to both of the above bills, since they regard such measures as having a tendency to deprive them of the monopoly of foreign exchange and to deprive them of the opportunity of speculating in foreign exchange. I am opposed to their speculation to the injury of our industries and commerce, and I allege that they have made millions out of speculation in foreign exchange, to the disadvantage of American commerce and to the disadvantage of the American producers and the American consumers alike. I allege their interest is a private interest, and that they are not concerned to deal with the matter from the public standpoint. I do not intend this comment as any reproach to them in their natural attitude to deal with the subject matter from the standpoint of their private interest. I merely call your attention to it and to what I assume should be our attitude as public servants to protect the public against private monopolies in international exchange.

Senator EDGE introduced on July 15, 1919, Senate bill 2472, authorizing the organization of corporations to deal in foreign banking, a copy of which is inclosed, and which I understand meets the views of the Federal Reserve Board and of the Secretary of the Treasury. I believe the banks dealing in international exchange would make no objection to this latter bill, for the reason that it simply gives a Federal charter to corporations to engage in international banking. While I should greatly prefer a Federal reserve foreign bank that would be a medium through which all American banks could function with assurance of equitable treatment, it will probably be better to pass Senate bill 2472 rather than take no action at all, for at least it would expand the facilities in the international banking field, and the Federal reserve foreign bank might be developed later. Indeed, I think under your authority the Federal Reserve Board could establish a division handling international exchange in the public interest rather than for private interests to do so, and which would function as a Federal reserve foreign bank without the name, and this might be acceptable to the Federal Reserve Board.

The Federal reserve act authorizes the Federal reserve banks to transact international banking business and authorizes the Federal Reserve Board to require them to do this, so that you have the power now to direct the Federal reserve banks to immediately open up foreign branches and transact foreign business for the protection of the public. If you do not support a Federal reserve foreign bank, then I appeal to you to compel the Federal reserve banks to open up foreign branches and transact the business which the Federal reserve act contemplates and in respect to which they have not discharged their full functions.

I venture to remind you that under the act of June 15, 1917, known as the espionage act, you directed the Secretary of the Treasury to administer the regulations relative to the export of coin, bullion, and currency by Executive order of September 7, 1917, and under the act known as "Trading with the enemy act," by Executive order of October 12, 1917, you further vested in the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to supervise the foreign-exchange operations, etc.

You have recently, by proper orders, vacated this machinery, but you have not canceled the original Executive orders. I respectfully suggest that these Executive orders should be canceled so as to leave the field open for the supervision and action of the Federal Reserve Board to the extent of their existing powers under the Federal reserve act in relation to foreign-exchange business free from a possible technical complication.

Mr. President, the suggestions of this letter would be valueless if I had no concrete proposal to make.

I make a concrete proposal.

I request that you submit this entire subject matter to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Federal Reserve Board, and to the Secretary of Commerce, and require of each of them an immediate written report upon these several bills, and direct them to submit recommendations as to what shall be done to protect the foreign commerce of the United States and stabilize international exchange, with a view to submitting such reports and recommendations to Congress.

Very respectfully,



AUGUST 18, 1919.

The President,  
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I take the liberty of submitting herewith a memorandum on the present condition of our foreign exchange and the need for administrative and legislative action thereon.

Last Saturday the exchange rates went down to the following low points, lower than ever before in the history of the world:

Sterling, \$1.26; premium, 60 cents per pound.  
 Francs, \$7.86; premium, 2.68 francs per dollar.  
 Lire, \$9.26; premium, 4.08 lire per dollar.

This means that on a credit to English buyers of American goods at 60 cents a pound our bankers are charging a premium of \$140,000 on \$1,000,000.

That they are charging a premium of \$519,000 on \$1,000,000 credit to French buyers of American goods, and \$768,000 premium for \$1,000,000 credit to Italian buyers of American goods, no part of which premium reaches American producers. The same bankers at one time during the war charged American importers for pesetas necessary to pay for importations from Spain, when pesetas went up to 30 cents, \$502,000 premium per \$1,000,000 of credit. These transactions go into hundreds of millions of dollars. The Spanish credits, of course, have now come below par, and the banks extending the credits made this profit, outside of interest and commissions. The Spanish banks got rich out of this harvest, and the American banks that used their credits in Spain have profited in the same way at the expense of the consumers in the United States. This was one of the factors which added to the high cost of living. These banks are now selling exchange short in New York on a very large scale, which means that they are selling sterling, francs, and lire (which they have not) with the expectation of buying them back in the future at a lower price, making good their contracts and profiting thereby. They have an interest, therefore, in depressing the price of sterling, francs, and lire, against the public interest and to the great harm of the consumers of Great Britain, France, and Italy, who were our allies in the Great War, faithful to death.

In like manner this is operating against our exporters and against the producers of America by interfering with their reasonable foreign market and exercising a depressing effect upon the values which they should receive for their goods and making their business unstable and extra hazardous.

These banks have no public function to serve from their point of view. They are engaged purely in dealing with exchange as a commodity and speculating on it. If you would instruct the governor of the Federal Reserve Board to make a confidential inquiry of the trust companies and the Comptroller of the Currency to make a like inquiry into the national banks engaged in this business, I am sure that you would find most abundant verification of the fact.

Such usury and profiteering is full of disastrous consequences and will inevitably react on the United States. You advised Congress wisely in your recent message on this subject, but it will take the full power of your administration and the cooperation of Congress to correct this condition.

I want to emphasize upon your attention that these dollars are being sold by somebody and that somebody is making these usurious profits to the injury of our national commerce going abroad.

On July 16, 1919, a month ago, I wrote you with regard to this, and I inclose a copy of that letter, together with the three bills therein referred to, the so-called Edge bill (S. 2472), the foreign finance corporation bill (S. 2590), the bill to establish a Federal reserve foreign bank (S. 2767), and the amendment to the War Finance Corporation (S. J. Res. 88). (Copies inclosed.)

The volume of these credits is so large that there is no danger whatever of overdoing the matter. The Federal reserve foreign bank ought to be established as a permanency. The amendment to the War Finance Corporation bill and the Edge bill will serve a present purpose, and both are approved by the Federal Reserve Board and, I believe, by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The foreign finance corporation bill (S. 2590) is opposed by the New York banks, and I do not believe can be passed. The other bills can be passed with your active support.

Very cordially and faithfully, yours,

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I submit these letters because they explain in a compact form certain facts and principles which I wish the Senate to have before it, so that, as far as I can, I may contribute to the proper protection of our foreign

commerce and prevent the serious consequences which may ensue if the Congress and the executive department fail to act.

To-day's papers announce the still further depreciation of exchange.

Those buying sterling, francs, and lire have no competition. The foreign exchange is controlled by a close monopoly of interests, which is moved alone by profits in handling foreign bills as a commodity under no governmental control or supervision of any kind. The end will be injurious to our commerce and industries.

Mr. President, it is impossible for me to doubt the solvency of Great Britain or France or Italy. These great nations have shown their great powers of production and recuperation in the past. With the increased use of machinery, of organization, of modern methods, tremendously stimulated by the war, and with the very great addition of women in the industrial life of these nations, there should be no difficulty on the part of these countries in meeting every obligation. Their history in the past has always been honorable.

It should be remembered that in the case of France, for example, while issuing a large volume of bonds, these bonds, comprising a national obligation, are held by her own citizens almost exclusively, so that the national debt is offset by the citizen credit, and neither adds to nor takes from the productive power of the people of France.

The destruction of property by the war in France occurred on about 5 per cent of the lands of France, and amounted to a destruction equal to about 40 per cent of the values on this limited area, a total of about 2 per cent of the values of France, which is offset by the tremendous expenditures of the nations of the world on French soil, such as the improvement of the harbors of France by the United States, the building of railroads, the furnishing of machinery, and the construction of warehouses. The warehouses built by the United States in France, if put end to end, would make a warehouse over 400 miles long. The inventive genius of the world has been greatly stimulated by war. The French people are a thrifty people. They are small landowners and holders. The distribution of the lands of France is so great that it comprises a basis of great stability economically, industrially, and politically.

It is to be assumed that France will correct the financial blunders made during the war by inflating the currency instead of selling bonds. France must retire her inflated currency by putting on a drive to sell French bonds to the French people and to sell French bonds to the people of the world. The French statesmen should make a plain statement of account, showing that France can and will meet her obligations to the world, and the French Government should have the resolution to require those who have profited by the war to contribute as substantially as Great Britain and the United States did through excess-profits taxes and progressive income and inheritance taxes. Undoubtedly France has the intelligence to do this; and now that the terrible excitement and confusion of war has passed, the world may and will expect France to live up to the high ideals which the past has demonstrated.

The same thing is true of Italy, and, of course, is still more obvious in the case of Great Britain. Nobody can doubt the solvency of Great Britain, and yet the pound sterling is selling at a discount in the United States of 14 per cent, the French franc at a discount of 55 per cent, and the Italian lire at a discount of 85 per cent. I should rather have said that the American dollar was selling at a premium of 15 per cent in Great Britain, 55 per cent in France, and 85 per cent in Italy. But the people of the United States can afford to extend credit to the merchants of Great Britain, France, and Italy at a fair rate. The credit of these merchants, backed by the British, French, and Italian banks, and backed in addition by the Government bonds of Great Britain, of France, and of Italy, comprises as sound a security as the world can afford and is entitled to credit at a reasonable rate. To charge a premium of 15 per cent or 55 per cent or 85 per cent in dealing with these nations is contrary to sound moral and ethical principles and contrary to sound banking principles.

The lack of justification is shown by our own experience with Spain, where the Spanish bankers sold pesetas at 30 cents, or at a premium so great that 66 cents of gold in Spain would buy a dollar of gold in New York. Spain was selling our merchants credit at a premium of 55 per cent, which our consumers paid plus a merchants' profit, and olive oil went to \$8 a gallon. No one could justify this on the ground that the United States was not solvent, yet it actually occurred. Now the peseta is down below par, which, of course, has taken place since Spain ceased to ship commodities to the world in excess of what the world shipped to Spain.

The best way in which to balance these exchanges and put the international credit system on a sound foundation is to

extend credits on a fair basis to counterbalance the excess of commodity shipments which is taking place from the United States to Europe and to the world. It is essential, to maintain our own markets, that we do this. A failure to do this has resulted in breaking down international exchange and has resulted in causing a powerful reaction in the stock market. It will result in lowering the price of commodities which are being shipped from the United States to Europe, and with the reaction in prices we may have a serious industrial reaction in the United States.

These matters require action by Congress and by the Executive Department in order to have the prosperity of the United States continue unabated. All patriotic men should cooperate to this end, and will do so if they understand the problem.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. PHELAN. Do I understand from the Senator in charge of the bill, which is the unfinished business, that there is to be no prolonged discussion of the bill to-morrow?

Mr. SMOOT. Not that I know of, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. PHELAN. There are no speeches announced on any subject for to-morrow?

Mr. SMOOT. I understand the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] is to speak to-morrow, but I have reference to the oil-leasing bill.

Mr. PHELAN. I was wondering why the Senator did not proceed with the bill at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say frankly to the Senator that there are one or two Senators who desire to speak on the bill who do not want to proceed to-night, but they will be ready to speak to-morrow.

Mr. PHELAN. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, August 22, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 21, 1919.*

## REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Frank A. Boyle to be register of the land office, Juneau, Alaska.

## MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Robert L. Faris, member Mississippi River Commission.

## COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Leon O. Tebbetts to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Maine.

George F. O'Shaunnessy to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Rhode Island.

David C. Dunbar to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Utah.

## POSTMASTERS.

## FLORIDA.

Louis J. Cowan, Daytona.

Gustavus M. Rhoden, Macclenny.

## MONTANA.

Lucy B. Cullen, Wibaux.

## PORTO RICO.

Nicolas Ortiz Lebron, Aibonito.

Jose E. Guenard, Mayaguez.

Teodoro M. Lopez, Vega Baja.

L. Castro Gelpi, Vieques.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, August 21, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Sometimes, dear Lord, in our quest for the transients, we overlook the eternal values of life, and dire consequences follow as a natural sequence.

Eternal vigilance, it has been said, is the price of liberty, and history confirms it.

If the wise counsels of the Mohonk Conferences had been heeded 20 years ago we would have been spared the terrible war through which we have just passed and the dire consequences to life and property which followed in its wake.

Give us the courage of our convictions and lead us onward and upward to the eternal values—life, liberty, truth, justice, righteousness. In His name. Amen.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have more Members present, and I make the point of order—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that when the gentleman makes a point of no quorum he should so state it and not make any other statement. If the gentleman wishes to make a point of no quorum, he should do so.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw it until the Journal is read.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House for a change of reference of the bill H. R. 8423, providing additional compensation to certain employees of the Post Office Department for overtime service, and also the bill H. R. 8424, for increased compensation for postal employees during the current fiscal year, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, what is it the gentleman wants?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KELLER] asks unanimous consent for change of reference of a bill relating to the salaries of post-office employees from the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. KELLER. Two bills, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Two bills. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

## TUNGSTEN ORES.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4437.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4437.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What became of the Igoo resolution? Was that voted on?

The SPEAKER. That was passed day before yesterday. The question is on the House resolving itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4437, with Mr. Goop in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4437) to provide revenue for the Government and to promote the production of tungsten ores and manufactures thereof in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate upon this bill has been concluded, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, et c.* That on and after the day following the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the articles named herein, when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions, the rates of duties which are herein prescribed, namely:

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, on day before yesterday, before my time expired—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we should have a quorum present, and I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum. The gentleman from North Carolina will proceed.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the bill day before yesterday, I stated that there was a monopoly in this country on tungsten ore and ferrotungsten. That has not been denied, and can not be denied. I stated that one corporation in California was producing over one-third of the tungsten ore and that that corporation and three other corporations produced over 75 per cent of the tungsten ore that is produced in this country. That has not been denied and can not be denied. I



stated that this bill if passed would take at least \$5,000,000 annually out of the pockets of the people and put it into the pockets of these four corporations. I stated that this bill if passed would absolutely fix this monopoly in this country and would finally give it a monopoly of all of the production. That has not been denied, and can not be denied. I stated that this bill was conceived, prepared, and written by the beneficiaries of the tariff proposed in the bill. That has not been denied, and it can not be denied. I stated that the rates which the beneficiaries of the tariff demanded of the Ways and Means Committee have been put into this bill without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." That has not been denied, and it can not be denied. I stated that this bill if passed would at once give four firms of importers in New York who now have, according to the evidence, 4,500 tons of imported ore stored there, \$2,700,000 as a clear bonus by enhancing the value of such ore that amount, and would give the producers here, who have stored 1,500 tons, a clear bonus of \$900,000 by advancing their price to that extent, or a total gift to those who are hoarding these 6,000 tons of ore of \$3,600,000. That was denied by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], who simply brushed it aside by saying, "That is not so," without proposing a scintilla of evidence to support his denial. The evidence in the hearing, which the committee has before it, shows exactly what I stated, and I state it now, and it can not be denied.

I stated that the rate in this bill on tungsten ore increases the rate of the Payne-Aldrich Act over 1,100 per cent; that it is over twelve times more than the Payne-Aldrich rate. That has not been denied, and that can not be denied in truth on this floor. I just dare one of them to deny it. They will have all of to-day to do it under the five-minute rule.

I stated that on tungsten and ferrotungsten the rate put into this bill by the Republican Ways and Means Committee, at the demand of the beneficiaries of this bill, was an increase of the rate in the Payne-Aldrich Act of over 800 per cent; that it was over nine times as high as the rate of the Payne-Aldrich Act. That has not been denied and can not be denied.

I stated that in this bill, with the \$1 per pound on tungsten and ferrotungsten and ferrotungsten powders, while they claim that this \$1 is only needed as a compensatory duty to offset the duty which is levied on the ore, it amounts to \$750 a ton more than is necessary to cover every cent of such compensatory duty. That has not been denied, and it can not be denied in truth. We have been and will continue all day discussing this bill. I challenge the author of the bill or any Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee or any Republican in the House to deny the truth of any one of these statements. You will have all day to do it in, but not one of you will be bold enough to deny any one of them. Gentlemen know that I have the proof before me of each statement I made, and now repeat. Mr. Chairman, I shall at the proper time move an amendment to reduce the rates in this bill down to the rate of the Payne-Aldrich Act, under which we were producing 75 per cent of the ore that we used in this country. But I know it will fail, because the Republican machine of this House will make it fail, as every Republican in this House has been ordered to vote for this bill just as it is. I am glad that you are going to repudiate the Payne Tariff Act to that extent. If you repudiate it by voting down my motion to restore the Payne-Aldrich tariff rates on tungsten ore and ferrotungsten, I shall then propose an amendment increasing the Payne tariff rates 100 per cent, making the rates on these products twice as high as the Payne-Aldrich rate.

Even that will be five times better than the bill you have now. I expect to see every Republican in this House, at the dictates of the machine, vote against that, and I shall expect to see every man on that side in this House, by his own confession and vote, repudiate and doubly repudiate the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act with respect to these products. I expect to see every Republican here throw away their convictions, their judgment, their very consciences almost, and vote just as the manufacturers and the beneficiaries of this plundering tariff demands that they shall vote, through the machine in control of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to bring something else to the attention of this committee, and I challenge any man on that side to deny it, that of all the profiteers during this war, of all the thousands of industries in this country that made immense profits out of the people and out of the Government during this war, this tungsten industry stands in a class by itself. I say it has made 100 per cent more profit than any other industry in this country during this war. I make the statement and challenge any gentleman here to deny it, that in 1916, before we actually got into the war, these tungsten-ore producers that are demanding this excessive, unparalleled tariff, after paying every cent of

the operating expenses, including overhead charges, taxes, and insurance, and even allowance for depreciation, made enough profit to take every cent of the capital that they put into the business and put it back into their pockets, and then, after getting back their capital had remaining as further profits over \$10,000,000, or 150 per cent more than the total capital put in, with the capital already in their pockets. Let me give the figures taken from the report of the Tariff Commission. They produced, in 1916, 5,900 tons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more to finish this, so that I need not get it by moving to strike out the last word in the next section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. They produced 5,900 tons in 1916 and they sold it for \$24,780,000. This is found on page 9 of the report. At that time they had a capital of only \$5,000,000 invested in it. They claim now that they have \$8,000,000 invested in it. There is not a word of evidence from any man that produced ore who has said it cost him in that year to produce it as much as \$800 a ton. I am going to say it cost them \$1,000 a ton, \$200 more than the evidence shows that it cost them. I am going to give them 6,000 tons, when they only produced 5,900 tons. They had only \$5,000,000 of capital at that time, but I will give them \$8,000,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If that is true, why was it necessary for the last Congress to offer a bonus to these people for the production of this ore for war purposes only?

Mr. KITCHIN. The act to which the gentleman refers authorized the Secretary of the Interior practically to offer bonuses for the discovery or production of war minerals. But he never did so. He never offered any to the producers of tungsten ore.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Tungsten was particularly mentioned.

Mr. KITCHIN. No. No bonus was ever offered to any tungsten-ore producer. And they did not discover or produce as much ore after that act was passed as in 1916. The act was passed only about a month before the armistice.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That was in itself an admission of the necessity of producing more of this ore than we were then producing.

Mr. KITCHIN. There is no such admission in it. The producers of the ore were producing all they could and making unheard-of profits. Let us get back to the immense profits of 1916. I am allowing them \$2,000,000 more than all the capital they had, or \$8,000,000. I am allowing them as operating and producing expense \$200 a ton more than the evidence shows it cost them to produce. Six thousand tons at an operating cost per ton of \$1,000 amounts to \$6,000,000 as total cost to produce. That added to the \$8,000,000 I allow them as capital is \$14,000,000. They got \$24,780,000 for it, so after paying every dollar of expense in the production, and after having returned all their capital and \$2,000,000 more in one year's operations, they have cleaned up a clear net profit of \$10,780,000, over 125 per cent; and counting the capital which they were able to put back into their pockets, 225 per cent clear net profit in the one year 1916. The figures of the Tariff Commission—their own figures—according to their own evidence show that in addition to this in 1917 and 1918 they made over \$6,000,000 clear profit, with their \$8,000,000 capital already returned to them. I want to tell you now that the man, whether he is a Republican or a Democrat, who votes for this bill will be voting for downright, stark-naked plunder and robbery. [Applause.] I want to hear somebody deny these figures that I have given. The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. FORDNEY] yesterday—let me show just how much these gentlemen know about this bill and about this subject. Mr. FORDNEY yesterday said, "Oh, what is Mr. KITCHIN making all this fuss about this for when this little tariff—when you figure it down—will not make an additional cost of tungsten steel of more than one one-thousandth of 1 cent a pound." That is, you take a cent and cut it up into a thousand pieces, and take one of those pieces, and that is all it is going to add to the cost per pound of tungsten steel. Now, the fact is that the additional cost in a pound of tungsten steel by virtue of this bill if passed is 18 cents, and in a ton it is going to cost 2,000 times that, or \$360. This is shown by the testimony of their star witness, Mr. McKenna, on page 41 of the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. I ask unanimous consent for five more minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. If you will tell the truth I will not object, but now you have made a statement which is not correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will object unless he confines himself to the facts as to what I said.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will take the stenographic notes of what you said. They will show that I stated exactly what you said.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not want to misstate what the gentleman said.

Mr. FORDNEY. I read from the record of what an expert said, and you know it.

Mr. KITCHIN. And I repeated what you read, did I not?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; you did not. Read it from the record and you will get it right.

Mr. KITCHIN. Have you got your notes here, unrevised?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Hand them to me and if you did not say what I said, I will give up. [Laughter.] Hand them to me. Read them again and they will show I quoted you correctly.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the leaders of the House ought to use parliamentary language in addressing each other. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman is certainly right.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is well taken. Gentlemen should not address each other in the second person.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman from Michigan will kindly furnish me with the shorthand notes of his speech, which he has in his possession, I will read from those notes and will show him that I quoted him correctly and I will show that he is as far out of the way as 1 cent is from 18,000. [Laughter.] That is all the difference; because the evidence is that in a pound of tungsten steel this tariff rate alone will make an extra cost of 18 cents, because 18 per cent of a pound of tungsten steel is tungsten. This tariff bill puts a dollar a pound on tungsten, and that makes 18 cents in one pound of tungsten steel. So instead of being one one-thousandth of 1 per cent, as the gentleman put it, it is eighteen thousand times that much, or 18 cents. [Applause.] So, with all due respect to the gentleman, he is just as wide apart from an accurate knowledge of it as 1 is from 18,000. [Laughter.] And further, with all due deference, the gentleman has just as much accurate knowledge about that as he has about the provisions of this bill. [Applause.]

Now, another thing I want to say: The Republicans urge the passage of this bill on the ground that the articles upon which it places the tariff are absolute war essentials. Are you honest in that? Do you think we ought to treat them as war essential minerals and metals? I admit that tungsten ore and tungsten are war essentials. They are absolutely necessary. Now, gentlemen, that being so, if you can just conquer your prejudices for a minute, if you can put aside your prejudices in favor of a protective tariff for "American industries" and look at this calmly in the spirit of real patriotism, then you can not vote for this bill.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] in one question went to the vitals of this matter as a war essential. Gentlemen remember that Dr. Hess, of the Geological Survey, who Hon. George Otis Smith, the head of that survey, said had been giving 13 years of special study to these and other minerals, testified before our committee that so far as he could see or anyone could see now, the total available amount in sight of tungsten ore in this country was 9,000 tons, and with a production of 3,000 tons a year would only last three years, and yet we need in this country from 5,000 to 7,000 tons a year. All in sight, says this expert, is 9,000 tons, which would give us 3,000 tons a year for only three years.

Mr. Young went right to the heart of it. He asked Dr. Hess:

A good deal has been said here about the desirability of bracing ourselves for the next war, if we have one. Now, if we use up all the tungsten we have in the United States during this period of peace following the war, and another war comes on and ties up the ocean transportation, in what position are we going to be to get our supply of tungsten ore to carry us through the next war?

To this Dr. Hess replied as follows:

Well, sir, we are going to be like a man in a boat on the wide ocean; there is plenty of water, but you can not drink.

I say that it is far better, far wiser to let this war essential ore remain untouched in the earth, to serve our country in the stress of war, if another should ever come, and let our people in peace times buy and use for commercial purposes the cheaper foreign ore than to pass this outrageous bill to gratify the

avarice of the monopoly of four corporations. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The day before yesterday the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] made one of his characteristic speeches. He has continued it to-day. Brilliant and able as the gentleman is—and I do not know anyone in the House more brilliant and able—the speech that he made was chiefly remarkable for the amount of misinformation that it conveyed to the House. I have known the gentleman since I came into Congress some eight years ago. When I first heard him deliver one of his tariff speeches I wondered that a gentleman of so much ability could be so obsessed on a subject, but I finally discovered that a large number of gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House were afflicted with what might be called "tariffphobia," a very dangerous disease, which renders the victim unable to see the facts with reference to any tariff matter, and also renders him utterly unable to state what they are. The gentleman from North Carolina has had this disease in the most violent form ever since I have known him. I have hoped at times that he might show some signs of recovery, but I have seen none, and have therefore concluded that he is beyond recovery.

The gentleman was more than usually entertaining the other day in making his speech. He had the jokes and I have the facts, and I want you to hear some of them. Permit me to let out some of the hot air from the balloons that were raised the other day and that have been inflated again this morning. It will be remembered that one of the subjects upon which the gentleman addressed the House so earnestly and in regard to which he received such great applause from the Democratic side was the fact that there was a manufacturer called before the Ways and Means Committee who testified with relation to what the tariff on tungsten ought to be. The gentleman spoke of the fact that the Republicans were always calling manufacturers, and indeed they do, because they allow them to state their side of the case. I fear very much, however, that some deluded gentleman on the Democratic side of the House thought the manufacturer called was one who was interested in having a high tariff. As a matter of fact a manufacturer of tungsten-steel tools, as this man was—and as I believe everyone in the House must know—is a man interested in keeping the tariff down. Who was this man, McKenna, this man who got up before the committee and to whom, according to the gentleman from North Carolina, the committee weakly yielded? He made the statement that the miners ought to have a tariff of \$10 a unit on tungstic trioxide.

Mr. McKenna is the president of the Vanadium Alloys Steel Co., which manufactures cutting tools, in which tungsten is used, and is one of the largest consumers of tungsten in this country. He is also an importer. That is the kind of men who came before us and said that the miners ought to have a tariff of \$10 a unit on tungstic trioxide.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, Mr. McKenna said that they owned ore mines and were interested in that way, too.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; they once had a mine.

Mr. KITCHIN. And Mr. Holmes, who was secretary and treasurer of one of the big companies—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, hold on. You can not make a speech in my time. Let me show how unfair your statement is.

Mr. KITCHIN. He says—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I decline to yield further.

Mr. KITCHIN. And Mr. Bailey, who said he represented the miners, said that he wanted a tariff of \$10 a ton.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, the gentleman has talked for an hour. I have not been speaking for three minutes, and yet he will not let me talk. Will my friend allow me to proceed?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, I permitted the gentleman to interrupt me, to correct me. Will not the gentleman accord me the same privilege?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no; I did not interrupt the gentleman at all. The gentleman from North Carolina says that this man was interested in a mine. He was interested in a mine which he tried to operate at a time when tungsten was high and lost money on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There was an affiliated company with the company which he owned, which at one time had an interest in a mine, and perhaps has the mine yet, worthless as it is, because they found they could not operate it at a profit during a time when tungsten was high. That is the situation with reference to this matter.

I asked the gentleman who there was who objected to the bill. That was the one solitary interruption that the gentleman from North Carolina talks about. I asked him that brief question, and what was his answer?

I said, "What party objected to this bill that came before the committee?" and he said, "The Democratic Party." The poor, old, decrepit Democratic Party is the only one that objected to this bill. Everybody else was satisfied.

As a matter of fact, on whom did the committee call? The most disinterested witnesses they could get. They called a man from the Tariff Commission, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], in commenting upon his testimony before the committee, said we would be likely to get the most disinterested testimony possible from somebody on that commission. Who else was called? A man from the Geological Survey, Mr. Hess. Can anyone be more disinterested than he? Who else talked before them? Importers? Yes; men who naturally did not want a tariff, and yet these importers said that this tariff ought to be granted. They were patriotic enough to support the bill, although it was not in their interest. They came in and said so. The firm of Gilchrist & Predmore sent a letter to us saying this tariff ought to be granted, although they are probably the largest importers. There was really only one person—

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Just for a question; yes.

Mr. JUUL. Am I correct in understanding this levies a tariff of 50 cents per pound on this metal?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. It is a tariff of a dollar a pound upon the pure metal content.

Mr. JUUL. The unit is here described as 20 pounds.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is getting me off my line of thought. He means a unit of tungstic trioxide.

Mr. JUUL. The gentleman said he was going to state a number of facts, and this is one fact I would like to ascertain correctly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is all given in the hearing. A unit is 20 pounds of tungstic trioxide. The gentleman understands that that is not the pure metal at all.

Mr. JUUL. That is exactly what I want to get at.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Tungstic trioxide is not the pure metal. It takes about 2½ or 2¼ pounds of tungstic trioxide to make a pound of the pure metal.

Mr. JUUL. I am glad to get these facts.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But I want to show the House that the committee heard men who were absolutely disinterested for the most part.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. Did these men of whom you speak give an opinion as to the amount of protection that should be placed upon this tungsten?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They did, and they were absolutely disinterested in the matter of giving information on the subject.

Mr. BUTLER. This rate is consistent with the views of the gentlemen of whom the gentleman spoke?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is in accordance with the views of those gentlemen, or the figures given by them.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did I understand the gentleman to say the tariff commission? There was so much talk going on. Did I understand the gentleman to say the tariff commission recommended these rates?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; he did not; but he gave facts and figures from which those rates would have to be inferred. He showed that in his personal opinion—for it was easy to read between the lines—but not speaking for the commission, this tariff ought to be granted. Now, that shows how far astray the gentleman has been in the statement that he has made, leading you to believe that we followed the opinion of interested parties when in fact we took the opinion of parties whose natural interest would be in the other direction, and still they said this tariff ought to be the amount given.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. Are the parties in interest—those who use the tungsten, who actively mine and develop it and use it in the industrialism of the country—have they made any objection against this tariff rate?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There was not a particle of objection from anybody. We have the testimony of consumers. We have the testimony of the men who use tungsten in manufacturing. We took the testimony of men who had interest in the other direction, and there was not a particle of objection from anybody. Well, I will correct that in one respect: There was a man who came before us—and we gave him a careful hearing—who had a mine over in South America, and he objected to this rate and said it was too much. He was the only man out of all the witnesses who came here who made a particle of objection to it.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I would like to ask the gentleman if the same gentleman did not acknowledge from the information he had that that rate was necessary for the mills of this country and the mines to operate?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. He did, and he said he was paying \$1.25 a day wages in his mine as against \$4 and \$6 a day paid in the mines here.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do.

Mr. SEARS. The gentleman said the consumers' representatives appeared before the committee. Will the gentleman name some consumer who appeared?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The manufacturer of vanadium steel tools was a consumer.

Mr. SEARS. But I understand, though, he is a manufacturer and sold it and also is interested in mines. I mean the real consumer.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. He was not interested in mines, except he had lost a lot of money in a mine which he had tried to operate.

Mr. SEARS. And now he wants to get it back?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. He had no way of getting it back; he could not get it back under the high price that prevailed, so he can not get it back now.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can not.

Mr. BLANTON. Just for one question.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Go ahead.

Mr. BLANTON. The American people are the consumers, and if they have to pay three and a half million dollars by reason of this bill because of 6,000 tons now being stored, we want to know what they say about the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will tell you what they would say about the bill. I will dispose of that matter. The gentleman from North Carolina said that by reason of there being some five or six thousand tons of ore stored at New York somebody was going to make \$3,000,000 out of it. What did that ore cost? It cost somewhere from \$17.50 to \$30 per unit of tungstic trioxide, and that was what ore cost. Now, if this bill goes into effect it is not expected and there is no reason to believe that it will sell in excess of \$17.50 on the market; so that instead of these men making this great sum the gentleman from North Carolina talks about there is merely a possibility they may recoup what they invested in war time in the hope of supplying the needs of the Government for tungsten. And I want to say further, in order to take care of any of this cheap ore that may come in before the bill becomes a law, I have an amendment which I shall offer to the bill which I have not time to discuss now. So much for that matter which was harped upon by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Now, there was another matter which the gentleman spoke of, and that was the question that he said he propounded to us. I wonder if the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] can state that question now. I wonder if he could get it the same way. I was not listening when he propounded it, and do not know what it was. My friend from Colorado, who asked him a question about the question, said the inquiry was as to how much ore would be required to make a ton of pure tungsten. So that the question—

Mr. KITCHIN. I will ask the question, which you could not answer day before yesterday, and I suppose that you have taken the last 48 hours to find out the right answer to it. It is, How much 60 per cent WO<sub>3</sub> standard tungsten ore will be required to make a ton of ferrotungsten?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, now, the gentleman can not answer that himself, nor can anybody else. That is one of those "foolish questions, No. 999999."

Mr. KITCHIN. I have the answer here, from the Geological Survey and the Tariff Commission.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman knows, and he ought to know, if he has studied this subject, even by taking this 60 per

cent ore, it depends on the kind of ore as to how much you get out of it.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I said 60 per cent ore.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. You can not always refine 60 per cent out of it, even if it is classed as 60 per cent ore.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is in the bill. That is how the report defines it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If that is true, it is a simple matter of computation of figures.

Mr. KITCHIN. Which you can not do and concerning which you do not know.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did not know what your question was. You were not sure of it.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman will permit it, I will leave it now and ask him to answer—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will answer it as quickly as you can ask it.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I want to answer the question for the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. He remembers the question this morning. He answered it the other day in his speech, but he has not printed that speech yet, and we can not see what his answer was. He answered his own question after I answered it, that there was about a ton and a fourth entering into a ton of pure product. But here is the answer, if the gentleman wants it. From 1 ton of tungsten ore of 60 per cent—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] be extended 10 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Make it two minutes. I am taking time from the gentleman from Michigan, who wants to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Iowa be extended two minutes.

Mr. JUUL. Make it five minutes.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I dislike to take the gentleman's time to answer this question.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I want you to do so.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I want to answer this and get it into the RECORD. There is recovered as pure tungsten out of a ton of tungstic ore of the richness of 60 per cent  $WO_3$  758 pounds. That is, 1 ton of 2,000 pounds tungsten ore equals 758 pounds pure tungsten. That enters into the tungsten steel and ferro-tungsten in various percentages, in accordance with the nature of the alloy. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] stated, the tariff on this amount to be covered is \$1 per pound of pure tungsten, or \$758, instead of the amount quoted by the gentleman.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can not yield to the gentleman. I just want to say it is perfectly plain, if the gentleman has given the question now as he wants it, that 60 per cent ore, if it is made to yield 60 per cent, will bring 1,200 pounds of tungstic trioxide, and it takes, as I said before,  $2\frac{1}{4}$  tons of tungstic trioxide to make a ton of pure ore, and that will give you the amount required if anybody wants to fix it. Therefore the answer of the gentleman from North Carolina was entirely wrong.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a different question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I want the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], and I know he is a conscientious man, to answer a question. The whole dispute between the Republican and Democratic members of the House and the Ways and Means Committee is as to the rate to be levied. Does the gentleman from Iowa say he does not believe that twice the amount of the tariff in the Payne bill is sufficient when under that bill they were producing 75 per cent of the product? Will the gentleman say that?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; I will say it when we come to the bill and when your amendment is offered. I do not care to take the time now, because I am taking the time which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] ought to have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] has expired.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MADDEN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, informed the House of Representatives

that the President had approved and signed joint resolutions and bill of the following titles:

On August 15, 1919:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on certain mining claims during the year 1919;

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Labor to lease the Charleston immigration station and dock connected therewith; and

H. R. 7110. An act extending the time for the construction of a bridge across Flint River, in the State of Georgia.

#### TUNGSTEN ORES IN THE UNITED STATES.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] a little while ago referred to a statement that I made on the floor of the House day before yesterday he was unfair. I want to repeat exactly what I did say. I read from the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, and from a statement furnished by William Loach, chairman of the tungsten committee of the Boulder County Metal Mining Association.

He said:

Extending this increase of cost into the finished steel, we arrive at the ratio of 15 cents per ton, or seventy-five one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound finished steel.

That testimony is in the record. Whether it is correct or not I do not know. I am not an expert on the manufacture or use of tungsten. Neither is there a man on this floor who is an expert and who knows all about the manufacture of tungsten. We must rely upon information given by experts that appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means, and that is the information that I rely upon.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will, if you will be very brief.

Mr. VAILE. I wish to suggest to the gentleman that the consumer of finished steel is the consumer that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is so concerned about—the ultimate consumer.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. Gentlemen, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] said yesterday that "when the manufacturers of this country came before the Committee on Ways and Means Mr. FORDNEY sat there in fear and trembling." [Laughter.] He said that when the manufacturer said "I want 60 cents duty," Mr. FORDNEY immediately wrote down 60 cents and gave it to him. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman will permit me, I never said that.

Mr. FORDNEY. That is the substance of the gentleman's statement. Whether those were the correct words or not, that is the substance of your statement. You never saw me in fear and trembling when any man was testifying before the committee, did you? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman permit me to make a correction? Both of us want to be fair to each other. Will the gentleman permit me there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I will yield, but I will ask the gentleman to be brief, if he please.

Mr. KITCHIN. I never said that when the manufacturer said "I want \$10 a unit" Mr. FORDNEY wrote it down. I said Mr. FORDNEY said, "What rate do you want?" He says, "\$10 a unit." Then I took up the bill and read from the bill. Everybody knows what you did. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. In his very entertaining speech on Tuesday the gentleman from North Carolina implied that Republicans accepted information from American producers as the basis for the rates of duty provided for in this bill. I might add that in the recent hearings before the committee we listened to some very sound testimony from representatives of American laboring men favorable to tariff protection. Further, we heard representatives of the Geological Survey, the American Mining Congress, and the Tariff Commission, and were quite convinced that in the interest of industrial independence for America prompt tariff protection should be afforded the tungsten industry.

In reply to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], and by way of contrast, permit me to offer a bit of evidence that



came to light in 1916 indicating the caliber of people whom the Democrats seemed to have blindly followed and catered to in the preparation of the tariff act of October 3, 1913. Truth will come to light. It took this information two years to come to the surface, but when it did come out it bubbled forth in an altogether unique and convincing manner. Sicilian fruit producers, it appears, together with some Italian importers, employed an attorney by the name of Beer, with offices at 71 Broadway, New York City, to lobby for a reduction of the import duty on lemons. The major portion of the fee was contingent upon results obtained, and on November 15, 1915, Mr. Beer filed a suit to collect the balance of the fee, which he claimed had not been paid as provided for by contract.

A very interesting report of the suit appeared in the New York Sun in March, 1916, and the following are significant extracts from the statement published in that paper. I referred to this matter once before on the floor of the House:

"It was provided," Beer said, "by the terms of the said agreement that the defendants were to pay the plaintiff and the said Osborne the sum of \$15,000 as a retainer, together with all expenses incurred by the plaintiff, and the said Osborne was endeavoring to obtain the aforesaid revision and general reduction of the said duty, and an additional sum of \$60,000 in the event that the duty on Italian lemons, either through act of Congress or any other function or instrumentality of the United States Government, was reduced to the rate equal to the rate of duty provided in the so-called Wilson Tariff Act."

Mention is made in the affidavit of a supplementary agreement that in case the tariff was cut from \$1.20 a box to 35 cents they were to have the \$60,000.

They went to work. The affidavit describing their labors says that they frequently appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Committee on Finance, hired speakers, and sent out millions of pieces of "literature."

"We can only say about this suit of Mr. Beer that we are surprised," said S. Amoroso, second vice president of the Importers' Union, yesterday. "Why should we be sued for \$75,000 or \$110,000? Why has it not been paid?"

"We did raise a fund, amounting in all to about \$140,000, to have the tariff on Sicilian lemons reduced, and we did hire Mr. Beer to have it done. In the United States the importers, by paying 5 cents a box on lemons imported, raised \$105,000, and the Sicilian societies raised \$35,000 more. Now that is all over, we are asked for \$75,000 more."

"What has become of the \$140,000? We do not know. We have repeatedly asked for an accounting and have not received it. We have demanded it and it has not been given to us. We are told to keep quiet, not to raise a row."

Mr. Beer presented his interpretation of the situation last night. His suit, he said, will soon be settled by the Sicilian societies of Palermo. "And I will be glad to get out of it," said Mr. Beer. "I do not want any more trouble like this. I do not mind saying that beginning with 1910 we accomplished some mighty effective work."

There are 2,000,000 voters of Italian blood in this country, he explained, and his first work was to get every one of them stirred up. Documents were sent to them favoring the Italian fruit growers, and letters, papers, "missionaries," speakers, and postal cards were used.

"In 1910," he said, "the effect of this movement was shown in the votes of close districts. All the Italians voted for the Democrats, and the Democrats realized it." In the presidential campaign of 1912 Mr. Beer said the Italians were in full swing for Woodrow Wilson. "We organized the Italian Democratic League," he said, "and had branches all over the country. We did nothing but preach democracy to them. I am a Republican except where my client's interests are concerned, and I want to say that the effectiveness of our work was well known and recognized."

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

The Fruit Importers' Union, through President Zito, has submitted the following statement \* \* \* of the receipts and disbursements in connection with the campaign and general office and labor expenses:

Cash received from July, 1910, to Aug., 1913.

PER TAX OF 5 CENTS PER BOX COLLECTED BY AUCTIONEERS, SICILIAN LEMONS.

Brown & Seccomb, from July, 1910, to Mar., 1911	\$12,854.55
Connolly Auction Co., from July, 1910, to Mar., 1911	27,537.79
H. Harris & Co., from July, 1910, to Mar., 1911	863.29
Philadelphia Auction Co., from July, 1910, to Mar., 1911	1,583.08
N. O. Fruit Auction Co., from July, 1910, to Mar., 1911	1,494.54
	44,153.25

PER TAX OF 2 PENCE PER BOX FROM AGENZIE E LEGA, SICILY.

Lega Agrumaria, from May, 1911, to Sept., 1912	\$20,206.60
Simp. Spence & Y., from May, 1911, to Sept., 1912	3,502.94
Hirzel, Feltman & Co., from May, 1911, to Sept., 1912	8,195.46
Lloyd Sabudo, from May, 1911, to Sept., 1912	2,104.58
Hamburg-American Line, from May, 1911, to Sept., 1912	488.17
White Star Line (Boston) from Feb., 1911, to Sept., 1912	697.40
White Star Line (New York), from May, 1911, to Sept., 1912	703.90
N. Y. Fruit Exchange, one half expense tel., from May, 1910, to July, 1913	303.27
Tax on boxes from several of Messina	1,284.38
	37,846.70

PER TAX SEVEN-EIGHTHS OUT OF 100 FROM AUCTIONEERS AND IMPORTERS, SICILIAN LEMONS.

Connolly Auction Co., Nov., 1912, to Aug., 1913	\$5,243.99
Fruit Auction Co., Nov., 1912, to Aug., 1913	2,213.49
Brown & Seccomb, Nov., 1912, to Aug., 1913	5,968.23
Connolly Auction Co., night permits	407.38
Brown & Seccomb, night permits	445.48
Fruit Auction Co., night permits	395.14
From importers: seven-eighths cent paid us directly	348.05
	15,021.76

Total.....96,661.71

Cash received in general	\$96,661.71
Campaign expenses	\$77,622.23
General expenses of Fruit Importers' Union, Aug. 13, 1913	15,076.87
	92,699.10
Balance in bank	3,963.61

We, the undersigned, members of the finance committee, have examined the books of the Fruit Importers' Union and have found accounting correct and to our entire satisfaction.

GIUSEPPE CAPPADONIA.  
FRANK ZITO.  
S. AMOROSO.

They also submit the following letter, dated September 15, 1913:

"Members of the general assembly of the Fruit Importers' Union, in their meeting of to-day, have voted on the motion of Mr. Fortunato Marciano D'Arzi as follows:

"Mr. D'Arzi moves that the members of the assembly give a vote of confidence to the board of trustees of the Fruit Importers' Union for having so wisely conducted the difficult negotiations for the reduction of the tariff on imported lemons, and at the same time to authorize them, the said board of trustees, to complete the possibility of the collection to pay the obligations assumed (at their own convenience) to the lawyers, collaborators who assumed to obtain the reduction of the tax on imported lemons."

The duty on lemons under the Payne tariff law was 1½ cents per pound. On the crate in general use this duty amounted to \$1.20. It is interesting to note that the tariff act of October 3, 1913, reduced the duty on lemons in packages—exceeding 1½ and not exceeding 2½ cubic feet—to 35 cents per package. On lemons in bulk the duty was reduced to 1½ cents per pound. This rate—35 cents per crate—is what Mr. Beer contracted to secure. In the suit and in statements concerning the controversy he claimed he did effective work for the Democratic Party and that his efforts were recognized.

Now, I ask, to whom did the Democrats listen when they were framing the Underwood tariff law? The producers of lemons in Florida and California were here protesting against a reduction of the duty on lemons, and at the same time the importers and foreigners maintained a highly paid lobby to work for a reduction. The duty was reduced and the paid lawyers of the importers claim they did effective work and were recognized. Gentlemen on the Democratic side, I do not make accusations of dishonesty, but I do say, however, that you gave your whole time and attention to, and permitted yourselves to be influenced by, the importer and the foreigner, absolutely to the detriment of your own people. [Applause.] Now, when Republicans come before Congress and offer a bill to increase the duty on tungsten, a very important metal, a metal absolutely necessary to industry in time of peace and war, you rise up in horror with accusations of bad faith. You accuse Republicans of being influenced by monopoly and not considering the laboring people of the Nation. No matter who makes it, that statement is far from true. We believe in America first, and we value industrial independence for the Nation. In framing tariff laws, the Republicans take into consideration all the people of every State in the Union without prejudice in favor of one industry or one State against another. [Applause.]

While alluding to the statements of the gentleman from North Carolina I want to state his general assumption "that the entire import duty is added to the price of all articles in this country" is erroneous and can not be substantiated. Upon this fallacious assumption he bases his tariff arguments. If his reasoning is sound, why do you think the people interested in Sicilian lemons were so willing to gamble \$140,000 in an effort to secure a reduction of duties on their products? Will anyone contend they did not know they could add a sufficient sum to their selling price to reimburse themselves? It was worth many times \$140,000 to get the reduction on citrus fruits.

Please listen to this testimony of Dr. Herty, formerly the head of the chemistry department of the University of North Carolina, relative to the effect of certain increased tariff rates contained in the act of 1916. I am reading from page 152 of hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on June 19 and 20 of this year:

Mr. MOORE. Then, the inference is that there was such competition in the manufacture in the United States following the passage of the act of 1916 that the prices were reduced?

Dr. HERTY. That was the point.

Mr. MOORE. The manufacture increased and the prices came down despite the fact that we levied a tariff in 1916?

Dr. HERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE. That is what you intend to illustrate?

Dr. HERTY. That bears out the situation.

Mr. HULL. You do not intend to convey the idea that competition would hold prices down under any kind of a tariff that might be necessary to protect the dyestuff industry?

Dr. HERTY. I can only judge by the results as shown here. The prices are coming down and there is competition.

Mr. MOORE. You came here from North Carolina, where you had been at the head of a college?

Dr. HERTY. The head of the chemistry department.

Mr. MOORE. Dr. Herty had become, by reason of his experience and knowledge of chemistry, one of the leading chemists in the United States and came here, despite all traditions, to support a protective tariff with regard to dyestuffs, and in spite of the fact that a tariff was levied which was supposed to be a high tariff and which according to the

theories of some gentlemen increases the cost of the product to the consumer in the United States. He comes here now to state that the operation of the law has been to so stimulate the industry in the United States as to encourage chemists to go to work and increase the manufacture, and that the prices have gone down by reason of the competition within the United States. That is what the doctor shows. Am I right about that?

Dr. HERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE. The price has gone steadily down in the United States and production has increased, so that we have been able to supply the consumer cheaper than ever before, despite the fact that a high tariff was levied. That is the fact?

Dr. HERTY. Yes, sir.

Does not this lead you to believe that the foreigner does not give the consumer in America the benefit of every tariff reduction? In 1909 an increased duty imposed upon hosiery transferred the major portion of the industry to this country, and domestic competition resulted in lower prices. Likewise, the duty was increased on post cards, with a corresponding result. Prior to 1909 over 90 per cent of the post cards were "made in Germany," and the universal price was 5 cents a card. Soon after a substantial import duty was levied 95 per cent of our post cards were made in America, and the popular retail price was 1 cent a card. This price resulted from healthy competition at home. I could show you how sugar prices have advanced during the season and the domestic crop is off the market. I could give any number of instances to prove that the basic assumption upon which the gentleman from North Carolina founds his arguments is ridiculous and unbusinesslike.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] said that this rate is a 900 per cent increase over the Payne tariff rate on tungsten. Why, you can fix any percentage of increase you care to think up, from nothing to everything, and that is just what you are doing. There is no imported tungsten which under existing law pays any duty. It comes in free. The only duty paid is on such tungsten as comes in in the form of metal, and not in the form of ore, therefore a per cent of duty may be rated very many hundred per cent when counted from nothing to something.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. There was a duty in the Payne-Aldrich law on tungsten ore and on pure tungsten.

Mr. FORDNEY. Ten per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GARNER. Ten per cent ad valorem on the ore and 20 per cent ad valorem on the tungsten.

Mr. FORDNEY. Depending on the value of the article.

Mr. GARNER. The value of the article.

Mr. FORDNEY. When valued at less than \$200 a ton the duty was 10 per cent ad valorem, and when valued at more than \$200 a ton the duty was 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GARNER. Yes. Now let me ask the gentleman this question: The Payne-Aldrich law having had that duty, the question here is not so much as to whether you are letting somebody dictate the rate of duty. The question is as to the rate. I think that is the main question that every man in this House wants to consider.

Mr. FORDNEY. I agree with the gentleman. That is fair.

Mr. GARNER. Why are you not willing to say that twice the amount of the Payne-Aldrich duty should be sufficient to maintain this industry when you consider the fact that 75 per cent of the tungsten used in this country was produced in this country under the Payne-Aldrich tariff? Will the gentleman answer that one question?

Mr. FORDNEY. The duty in the Payne-Aldrich law was ad valorem, and this duty is specific.

Mr. GARNER. Just a moment—

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me answer you.

Mr. GARNER. All right.

Mr. FORDNEY. Tungsten is selling now for \$7.50 a unit in this country. The ore in this country that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] referred to as being stored here was imported, as the evidence from a Government authority shows, at from \$20 to \$30 a unit. That is what the ore cost the importer. During the war, when we must have tungsten and must depend on imported tungsten, we paid as high as \$90 a unit. Now, if you will base the ad valorem rate on \$90 a unit, you will have \$9,000 a ton duty, or if based on \$10 a unit, the duty would be \$1,000. You can not measure an ad valorem duty fairly in comparison with a specific duty when the value fluctuates from \$7.50 a unit to \$90 a unit. It is no fair comparison, sir. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. I believe the gentleman from Michigan will admit that it is nearly impossible, if not quite impossible, to get at the cost of production in this country and the cost of production abroad. Therefore it is difficult to levy any

rate from that standpoint. Now, I am putting this concrete situation to the gentleman: Under the Payne Act we produced 75 per cent of the tungsten used in this country. If we double the rate, ought not that to be sufficient to enable us to continue to produce 75 per cent of the tungsten used in this country?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not think so.

Mr. GARNER. Tell me why.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell you why as nearly as I can. It is a very difficult question to answer under present conditions, but the gentleman is fair and his question is fair. My good friend, it does not depend so much upon the justness of the duty as it does upon sustaining an industry that we must have when we need it badly. What difference does it make to you whether the rate is high or low, if the question is whether we can be sure of getting the metal to fight the enemy when we need it? That is the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARNER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more in order that he may answer my question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Michigan be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. I am just as anxious as the gentleman from Michigan is to maintain this industry in this country and have it so that in case of war we may have this metal.

Mr. FORDNEY. I had not quite concluded my answer.

Mr. GARNER. As I say, I am just as anxious to maintain this industry in this country as the gentleman is, so that we may have a sufficiency of it in case of war. The only question here is as to the rate, and I submit that when under the Payne-Aldrich Act we produced in this country 75 per cent of the metal necessary to run the Government, on a 10 per cent duty, now that we propose on this side to double that amount it does seem to me that that rate should be sufficient to maintain the industry in this country.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have not time to read from the record, but the gentleman is fair about it and I have a statement before our committee which shows that the major portion of the tungsten ore of the world is controlled by the British, and in Asia where the ore is controlled by the British they are mining it and bringing it to England for \$1.92 a unit, tungsten ore of 60 per cent purity. When the price of tungsten declined to \$17 a unit after the armistice our mines were compelled to close down, and they have been closed ever since. We can not produce it for less than \$17 per unit. That is the testimony before the committee. Other testimony is that China can produce tungsten and lay it down in this country at \$7 and \$8 a unit.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] seems to be harping upon the fact that under the Payne-Aldrich Act we produced 75 per cent of tungsten used in this country.

Mr. FORDNEY. We used a very small amount at that time.

Mr. SNYDER. At that period the use of tungsten in self-hardening steel was hardly known, and the quantity which we produced then, which may have been 75 per cent, is less than 10 per cent of what we are using to-day.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. Out of our total annual consumption of some 7,500 tons to-day we are producing but 25 per cent, which is more than 100 per cent of our consumption at the time the gentleman referred to. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A Bourbon has been described as a man who forgets nothing and who learns nothing. The world moves and constantly changes and wise men change with it, but your Bourbon never does. He is the only finite thing on this mundane sphere to whom may be ascribed those attributes of the infinite—the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Other men learn, he never does. Experience means nothing to him. It is true that his virtues do not change, but neither do his vices. He has so very few virtues, however, that that does not matter much.

Some Democrats have objected to the appellation of the name "Bourbon" to their party, and I am frank to say that in the recent past, at times, the party has made just a little progress; at least some of its members have in getting away from Bourbonism, but so far as certain gentlemen in command of the party are concerned, we have had the strongest kind of proof in the last day or two that their Bourbonism continues unchanging as of yore.

We have had a great war, and the Great War has taught most of the people of the world many things. It has emphasized—aye, it has burned into the minds and consciences of all



wise men—the fact that nations to grow and prosper and hold their place on the world and be mighty and influential for good in the world must in the main be self-supporting. The war has proven to wise men the utter folly of depending upon others for those vital and essential things which you may and can produce yourself. The war brought us face to face with a situation in which this, the greatest Nation on earth, the most powerful people in the world, the land of the greatest resources, was at the mercy of foreigners and of the enemy. We lacked the materials necessary for the manufacture of powder needed to hurl the instruments of destruction. We lacked the minerals that were essential to put a cutting edge on the tools necessary to make the implements and instruments of destruction. We propose to see that such a condition does not exist in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Strong and forceful, powerful though we were, we were almost helpless in the face of a foreign monopoly on certain essential products. Most of the American people took an oath deep down in their hearts that this condition should not exist in a future emergency. [Applause.] Yes, and the people who pledged themselves to that proposition do not all of them vote the Republican ticket, and they have not all of them heretofore subscribed themselves as protectionists, for there is some wisdom even among bourbons, among the forward looking of the party. We have looked forward to the time when we should be able to place America in a position of independence in the matter of essential materials. We have looked forward to that time in the hope and expectation that we would have some little support at least from the Democratic side of the aisle, and I think we will have some such support. I am certain we will have it, but it is very evident that we are not to have any support, any comfort, in establishing the economic independence of America from some of the leaders on that side. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. The very first effort that is made to establish the independence of this country in a product that is essential instead of finding the kind of support and assistance that we gave gentlemen on that side during the war we are met with unfair criticisms and misstatements of the facts.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I have only a couple of minutes.

Mr. GARNER. I shall get the gentleman some more time if I can. The gentleman is now discussing essentials. I ask the gentleman to consider the question of rates to be levied in this bill. That was the only difference between this side and the Republican side, at least so far as I am concerned. I want to fix this industry so that it will maintain itself in this country, but I do not want to levy a rate that is absolutely ridiculous, as I think the rate in this bill is. For instance, under the Payne law we had a certain rate under which we produced in this country 75 per cent of the products that we are putting the rate on. If we were able to do that under that rate, it does seem to me that if we double the rate we could continue to do the same thing.

Mr. HAMILTON. May I ask the gentleman from Texas if he is speaking for the Democratic Party in making that statement?

Mr. GARNER. I am speaking for myself.

Mr. HAMILTON. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. MONDELL. I am glad to have the statement of the gentleman from Texas that he desires to put this industry on its feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement to that effect. I am inclined to believe that there are many gentlemen on that side who feel that way; but the way to accomplish that, I want to say to my friend from Texas and others, is not by relying on his judgment, for, while he is a very wise man in many ways, I assume he does not know much more about tungsten than I do. The way to accomplish that is to depend upon the judgment of men who know. The remarkable fact in connection with this bill is this, that while it is to the interest of men mining tungsten in foreign lands to have the duty low, and while it is to the selfish interest of many manufacturers

to have the duty low, practically all of those who came before the committee, importer and manufacturer alike, the men representing interests that were selfishly interested in keeping the price of tungsten low, were in agreement in the main on the rates proposed by the committee. And I intend in this as in all other matters to take the judgment of the committee, to take the judgment of the men who know, to take the judgment of the men who have studied the matter and who have arrived at an agreement as to the rate. It is barely possible that the tungsten industry in America could be developed with a rate somewhat lower than that proposed. It is possible. I doubt it; but I do know this, that a rate now placed on tungsten such as is proposed will make America in a short time largely independent of foreign nations as to tungsten, and I do know that as soon as it is demonstrated that American tungsten can be produced at a rate lower than the price that will be established by competition under this law the Congress will reduce the tariff rate. [Applause.] That is the history of Republican legislation. Gentlemen, the important thing is to make us largely independent of all the world in the matter of tungsten. This rate will do it. It is doubtful if a lower rate would. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to speak for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the discourse of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in describing the Bourbon is the best description of the Republican Party that has ever been given since the morning stars first sang together. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It fits his party like a glove, for in truth it never learns anything and never forgets. The gentleman from Wyoming knows, and no one knows better, that the Republicans were driven out of this House in 1910 more on account of the Payne tariff bill than any other one operating cause. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, this strange thing happened: When the first Underwood bill was introduced here the Hon. JAMES R. MANN, who was the Republican leader then—and he was as able a Republican leader as has ever been in this House, I will say that much for him, it is my honest opinion—every time that a rate was changed from the Payne bill in the Underwood bill, he arose in his place and offered to amend by substituting the Payne rate as something almost sacred, although he voted against the conference report on the Payne bill and spoke against it. Well, now, you have got back again in the House and Senate, and you not only commence where you left off but you make it worse than it was before. There is a game played in which there is a phrase of "raising your opponent," and that is what you are doing now on your own record.

A MEMBER. What is it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have forgotten the name of the game. But these gentlemen have gone far afield in this debate here to-day. Brother FORDNEY harked back to the tariff on lemons in 1911 or 1912, or some where along there, and spent all of his time on that. Well, whatever happened then has gone. Macauley says that when Charles II came back from exile, or as Charles himself facetiously termed it, his travels, he had the greatest opportunity any man ever had of being the most popular King of England, for all he had to do was to do what was right. But he went back to his old wallow. The consequence was his brother, the ill-fated James the Second, was sent on "his travels." I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. He is the only one of the whole crowd of you who has the courage of his convictions and is willing to go the whole hog. [Laughter.] You new Members here do not know it, but I have stated on the floor of this House a half a dozen times that if you gave Brother FORDNEY carte blanche to write a tariff bill there would be but one sentence in it, and that would be that anything that can be produced in America and also abroad shall not be imported into this country at all. [Laughter and applause.] But now if the rest of you will go with Mr. FORDNEY you will have it fixed to the queen's taste. He said here the other day—and it seems strange to me that he or any other man of intelligence would state such a thing, and this has nothing to do with the tungsten bill any more than his speech had [laughter]—he said here the other day, in substance, that whenever the Republicans were in charge you had prosperity, and when we were in charge you did not.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is not that true?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, sir; it is not; not a syllable of it is true. If you can remember 1873. Gen. Grant was Presi-

dent. There were hardly enough Democrats in the House to call the yeas and nays. The Senate was overwhelmingly Republican; the Republicans had had the Government for years and years, and a panic swept over this country which made men's teeth rattle from sea to sea and carried bankruptcy and ruin all over the land. You may be too young to remember, but—

Mr. LAYTON. Was it not due to the war?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; it was not due to the war. I will give you a sample and let you see if it was due to the war. In 1907 Theodore Roosevelt was President. You had both Houses of Congress. You had had them for years, and there came a panic in September, October, and November of 1907 that as high a Republican authority as Senator Aldrich said was the severest panic that this country had ever known. No war produced that. Surely not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAYTON. Made to order in Wall Street?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; and Wall Street is ordering this bill here to-day, too.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that his colleague may have five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, I want to tell you what I think about this debate. Like old Harper used to run horses in Kentucky, "from e'en to e'en"—

Mr. FORDNEY. I understood the gentleman to say that Wall Street ordered this bill. What evidence has the gentleman of that?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have not anything but the regular evidence, that they order the Republican tariff bills.

Mr. FORDNEY. What evidence have you of that?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have been here 25 years, and I have seen these fellows around these corridors, even in these committees, and I have never seen anybody come here to represent the great body of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It was always some fellow with an ax to grind.

Mr. FORDNEY. Does the gentleman know that there were laboring men before the committee recently asking for increased duties on articles produced in this country?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not know it.

Mr. FORDNEY. Of course the gentleman did not. He was not present and was not trying to inform himself. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not know who went before the committee as to this bill.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman did not inform himself, did he?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Not on that particular point. Did you?

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman expressed that language when he was not really well informed, and said that we were catering to Wall Street.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, that is the gentleman's question. Does not the gentleman think that I am as well informed generally as he is? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. My dear friend, I rather think you are, except on this subject.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The tariff is a subject that I have studied over more than any other subject. I will tell you what happened when both you and I were on the Ways and Means Committee when the Payne bill was under consideration. There were never but two men engaged in any protected industry that came in there and said that the tariff ought to be reduced—only two. And you folks had carried that election in 1908 on the proposition that you were going to reduce the tariff. There was a man who came in there, a tin-plate man, that seemed to me to be a very reasonable man—

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will.

Mr. FORDNEY. Is it not true that the Payne tariff law did reduce rates more than 25 per cent below the rates in the Dingley law?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, sir. What happened was that the Payne bill raised the average tariff rate 1.71 per cent. I demonstrated that here on the floor of the House the day we discussed the conference report.

Mr. FORDNEY. If you will take the ad valorem rates under the Dingley bill you will find they average 26½ per cent and under the Payne law 18½ per cent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On the day that we discussed the conference report on the tariff bill I proved that it raised the rates 1.71 per cent, and the Secretary of the Treasury adopted

my figures. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is just exactly what he did. You people had an army of experts, and I had one poor schoolmaster from Arkansas that outfigured the whole crowd of them, and the Treasury adopted my figures. There was a tinplate manufacturer who came before that committee, and he said we should take one-half of a cent a pound off of tin; that we did not need it any more, and that in a few years we ought to take another half a cent off and leave the American tinplate manufacturer a differential of one-half a cent; that that was sufficient. He said when they started in the tinplate manufacturing they needed the cent and a half in order to get the American markets. Outside of that man, who seemed to be a candid man and a fair man and a good American, there was a man who was engaged in the scrap-iron business. He said there was no sense in the tariff on scrap iron. Outside of those two, every blessed man that came in there to testify wanted a raise in the tariff.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Did not Mr. Carnegie ask that steel products be put on the free list in the preparation of that bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 10 minutes more.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, no; I do not want it. Is my time exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Kansas, I do not know as to Mr. Carnegie. I think he was there one day when I was not there. Somebody inveigled me to go down to North Carolina to make a speech.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He was on his feet for eight hours, and underwent one of the most severe cross-examinations I ever heard a witness subjected to, and was cross-examined by Republicans. He was not in favor of a tariff on his product. He wanted to put it on the free list.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not happen to be there that day. I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] that we should produce in this country, if possible, articles needed in war, and the production of such articles should be encouraged, but the pending tungsten bill is protection run mad.

I will give you my opinion about this debate. This is in some features a very futile debate, and I feel that I really ought to apologize to the House for having taken any time on it myself. We have certain things that should be done in this Congress. We ought to do what we can to cut down the high cost of living. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why did not the Democratic Party get busy in 1913 on the high cost of living? It was an issue in 1912. This is all poppycock.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Maybe it is; but I will tell you what kind of poppycock it is. It will put all you fellows out if you do not attend to it. [Laughter.] That is true, just as certainly as you are alive.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is speaking from experience? [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No. I am showing you what will happen to you. There will not be enough of you in the next Congress to demand the ayes and noes unless you cut down the high cost of living and relieve millions of men, women, and children from starvation. I think we ought to go to work and leave out the speech making and do what we can to relieve the distresses of the people of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is bootless to indulge in crimination and recrimination about it. Everybody knows that there is more than one element entering into the high cost of living. One of those elements is the expansion of the currency. There is no sense in anybody lying about it. Another element is these trusts, that have fixed up the prices of everything. Still another is the profiteers, and I have stated it over again several times that every profiteer in America ought to be put in the penitentiary. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will add one more sentence. I am in favor of quitting these extraneous debates and getting down to the work we are sent here to do. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]



Mr. HAMILTON. I hope the gentleman will exercise his good offices among his colleagues on the other side to that end.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will, and also with oratorical Republicans.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, has only the first section of the bill been read, or have the first two sections?

The CHAIRMAN. The first section.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to enter into any line of parliamentary dispute with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. Mr. Chairman, I do most heartily agree with him in the statement he makes that we had better get down to business and attend to the kind of business for which we are sent here. If I have sensed at all the sentiment of the times along that line, it is to do something for the American workingman. He can hardly from his day's pay make both ends meet, and that is one of the reasons for the passage of this very bill and for the passage of bills similar to it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Every time there is a word said here about any increase of tariff the picture that the leading Member on the Democratic side painted the other day, of somebody trembling, is presented, and that applies to the whole Democratic Party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] referred to an ancient game that is probably more common with the people of Missouri than with those of Massachusetts, and therefore naturally I plead great ignorance about the conditions under which that ancient game is played. But he said something about "raising" somebody else. He says that we are "raising" the duties provided for tungsten in the Payne-Aldrich bill, which was passed by the Republican Party when in the majority here. We are doing nothing of the kind. The Underwood bill came along and swept aside all duty on tungsten ore, and that is the condition that faces that industry to-day. There is no duty whatever on tungsten ore, and if we are raising the rate at all in this bill over the rate of the Payne-Aldrich bill, the reason for it is very clearly stated by Mr. F. C. Armstrong, the United States mineral surveyor, in his testimony at Denver. I am going to refer to this matter a moment later, but I want to refer to it particularly as applied to the statement of the gentleman from Missouri. Here is the reason, my friends, for this proposed increase in rates.

Mr. KITCHIN. What page?

Mr. TREADWAY. Page 82. I read:

Mine labor, obtainable for \$3 per day in 1914, now costs from \$4.50 upward, and is not nearly so efficient.

There is the reason for any increase of rate in the present bill, namely, the rate of pay of the laborer has increased over 50 per cent, and we want to meet that increase. The Republican Party has always stood for proper wages for the workingmen.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TREADWAY. No. The gentleman from Texas takes a great deal more time on the floor than I do and I decline to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. There is the reason, gentlemen, for the increase referred to in this bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. The testimony there is to the effect that there is an increase of 50 per cent in labor. I ask the gentleman the question if the increase of 100 per cent in the Payne bill is not sufficient to meet that?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Armstrong appeared before the United States Tariff Commission and estimated the actual increase in the cost of production from both of these causes at 100 per cent. That is the gist of his testimony. Similar testimony was given also by other witnesses. He says:

In view of the increased cost of living, the higher wages are by no means unreasonable, but in connection with other elements of cost they are fast making a loss in the industry of mining.

That is the testimony of a United States official.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. If you increase the Payne-Aldrich rate 100 per cent, ought not that to reach the situation?

Mr. TREADWAY. No. We are faced by the situation left by the Democratic Underwood bill, with no tariff whatever on it.

Mr. GARNER. Yes; but I am taking the Payne bill rate and doubling it.

Mr. TREADWAY. You are talking about the Payne bill, which became a law in 1909, and this ore was not discovered in this country until 1900. Practically there was in this country no product at the time of the enactment of the Payne bill making the rate such as the gentleman from Texas is calling attention to now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BLANTON. I object, if the gentleman can not yield to a civil question.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman was speaking on a pro forma amendment.

Mr. TREADWAY. No. I got unanimous consent to speak for five minutes. Now I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How much time remains for debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The debate upon this paragraph has been exhausted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The debate is proceeding by unanimous consent, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been exhausted on this paragraph and has been proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. The debate having been exhausted, the gentleman from Massachusetts is out of order.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have made a new motion.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman can speak only by unanimous consent, and I object.

Mr. TREADWAY. I can speak on my motion.

Mr. BLANTON. I raise a point of order against that, the debate having been exhausted—

Mr. TREADWAY. The debate has not been exhausted on that motion, because it has never been started on that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think that several gentlemen have spoken on that motion.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I raise a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled, and the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORDNEY. In answer to the gentleman from Texas, I wish to call attention to the difference between an ad valorem duty and a specific duty. The gentleman from Texas said they were proposing to double the Payne rate. The Payne rate was 20 per cent on high-priced tungsten when valued at more than \$200, 20 per cent ad valorem. When the price is what it is now, that amounts to \$1.60 a unit; but when tungsten was selling at \$90 a unit, it amounted to \$1,800 a ton. Now, the ad valorem duty changes with the price of the article. A specific duty does not change. The duty provided for in this bill does not change, but an ad valorem duty changes as the price of the tungsten goes up or down. The ad valorem duty is unfair, because it fluctuates all the way from \$1.60 a unit to \$1,800 a ton.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think the gentleman from Michigan has several times explained that point, but naturally the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] does not wish to see it. There is no question about that. Now, I would like to get back to the consideration of the bill just for a moment. I commend to the members of the committee a careful perusal of the statement made by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE] and his colleague [Mr. VAILE]. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE] has already spoken, but if the members of the committee will read the statement and the memorandum which he submitted at the time of the hearing, and decide this question on its merits rather than on the false platform of what

may be or may not be regarded as party policy here, but on the merits of the industry itself, they will vote unanimously for this bill.

And further let me commend to your consideration the statement by Mr. VAILE, also found in the hearing. I want to read to you just a very few sentences from that:

It will be remembered that when the United States entered the war the production of these minerals was at a very low ebb. Many causes doubtless contributed to this situation, but it was attributed by the producers chiefly to the absence of a protective tariff adequate to meet the ever-increasing cost of labor and materials.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the motion to strike out the last paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Massachusetts will confine himself to the motion.

Mr. TREADWAY. I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to read the statement made by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE], found on page 80 of the hearings, if he thinks it advisable to strike out the paragraph. This is the statement of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE]:

The tariff of 10 per cent ad valorem on tungsten had been removed prior to the war. In 1914 the United States had produced practically half of the tungsten consumed in this country, the imports coming chiefly from Australia, Portugal, and South America.

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman is not speaking to his motion.

Mr. TREADWAY. I can make just as much noise as the gentleman from Texas can, and can speak just as long.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. TREADWAY. I will put my lungs up against his lungs at any time.

Mr. BLANTON. I raise the point of order that the gentleman should obey the ruling of the Chair and confine his argument to the paragraph.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] can not tell me what the ruling of the Chair is. He can impose on some people, but he can not impose on me.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is going to see that the rules of the House are obeyed.

Mr. TREADWAY. I was a Member of this House before the gentleman from Texas came here, and will try to be here after the gentleman from Texas has gone.

Mr. BLANTON. You may be left at home.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will suspend. The point of order is well taken. The gentleman must confine himself to the motion before the House. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. TREADWAY. In reference to the motion to strike out the paragraph, I was reading from the statement of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE], as follows:

Through the competition of labor earning 50 cents per day in those countries, American producers were unable to compete with the mines of other countries, and when those mines were closed to us by lack of ocean transportation the United States suddenly found itself impelled to feverish haste in the attempted revival of the production of minerals absolutely essential to the making of armor plate and high-speed tools.

The entire statement of the gentleman [Mr. VAILE] is illuminating upon the subject and expresses the case very concisely. Coupled with the two statements of our colleagues from Colorado, the brief of the United States Tariff Commission, as found on page 70 of the hearings, makes the case complete and proves the need of the passage of this bill. It was my purpose to read further from the committee hearings, but the frequent interruptions have consumed the allotted time.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman is disobeying the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why did not the gentleman from Texas make the point of order against his own side?

Mr. BLANTON. Because the gentleman from Massachusetts declined to yield to me.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, the gentleman from Texas should be fair.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will be in order. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNUTSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts be given five minutes additional.

Mr. BLANTON. I object. He would not answer a civil question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. KNUTSON. We will not have any more Democratic speeches extended. I will promise you that.

Mr. BLANTON. You will have no more Minnesota speeches either.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. CALDWELL. A point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. There was a motion made to strike out the paragraph, and I demand a vote on that motion.

Mr. TREADWAY. I withdraw the motion.

Mr. CALDWELL. I object to the withdrawal of the motion and demand a vote on it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. He can withdraw it at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. Then the question will recur upon the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CALDWELL. On the point of order, or, at least, a parliamentary inquiry. How can we go ahead and read the balance of the bill when a motion is pending to strike out the section?

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to close debate can be made at any time. After that motion is determined, then the question will recur on any pending motion as to the paragraph that has been read.

Mr. CALDWELL. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that debate on this paragraph be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I now withdraw the objection that I had to the gentleman's withdrawing his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts now withdraw the pro forma amendment?

Mr. CALDWELL. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. I object to the amendment being withdrawn, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question then recurs upon the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KITCHIN) there were—ayes 61, noes 97.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. FORDNEY and Mr. KITCHIN to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 82, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

First. Crude tungsten, ores, and concentrates, \$10 per unit of tungsten trioxide therein contained, a unit being herein defined as 1 per cent of tungstic trioxide in a short ton of 2,000 pounds.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the word "tungsten" and insert the word "tungstic."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is willing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object. No; I withdraw the objection. I will not be so uncivil as that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the words "tungstic trioxide."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.



The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "pounds," insert the words "namely, 20 pounds of tungstic trioxide."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I hope the membership of the committee will pay attention to what I am about to say. Day before yesterday in the discussion of the bill, and I repeated them again in my first remarks to-day, I made several statements with respect to this bill, and challenged denial then, and again repeated the challenge to-day. Not one of the statements I made has been denied, and I challenge again any Republican on the committee or in the House to deny a single one of them. We have had three or four speeches—I think four speeches—from members of the Ways and Means Committee, and not one member of the committee on the Republican side has disputed or denied a single one of those statements. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] arose, as it appeared, to accept the challenge, but instead of attempting a denial of any one of my statements proceeded in an attempt to show that I had misstated the facts with respect to another proposition. He said he wanted the Members of the House to consider "Mr. KITCHIN's statement after the hot air had been removed from it." I want to state exactly what the evidence shows. The gentleman said that I had asserted in my argument day before yesterday that producer after producer had demanded a tariff of \$10 a unit on tungsten ore, and that, complying with such demand, \$10 a unit tariff was put in. He then asked "why Mr. KITCHIN did not state the facts." He said that the truth is that only one interested person asked for a tariff of \$10 a unit on the ore, and that that was Mr. McKenna, who, he said, was a manufacturer of ferrotungsten, not a producer of ore. I want to show that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] knows just as little about this bill and the evidence as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] or any other Republican on the committee or in this House [laughter], and how far from the fact he is.

Mr. Holmes, Mr. Bailey, and Mr. McKenna, all financially interested in the industry, appeared before the committee and demanded a tariff of \$10 a unit. Look at the testimony—the gentleman has it in his hand—and if everyone that appeared of these interested manufacturers and producers did not demand \$10 a unit, then I will vote for this bill.

Not only that, but turn to page 6 of the hearings and you will find there a brief prepared by the manufacturers for my friend, Mr. TIMBERLAKE, in which they demand \$10 a unit. Yet he says that the only man financially interested who asked for a tariff of \$10 a unit was Mr. McKenna. Turn to Mr. Holmes's testimony, pages 16 to 27. He is the secretary and treasurer of the Tungsten Products Co. He came here in the interest of this bill. Turn to page 10 and you will find a telegram addressed to Mr. TIMBERLAKE, which he introduced in evidence, signed by 21 corporation producers of tungsten ore, all, no doubt, controlled in the matter by the big four, demanding that we put in this bill a tariff of \$10 per unit. Yet he says that nobody interested but Mr. McKenna asked that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. For just a question. I have only five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman has not stated it strong enough. I said that Mr. McKenna was a consumer and user of the material, and these 21 people that you are talking about did not appear before the committee at all.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; but they sent this telegram for the committee and it was read to the committee. Turn to pages 16 and 17 and you will find a telegram from the Standard Tungsten Co., another from the Cooper-Chaley Co., another from the Pine Creek Tungsten Co., and another from the Tungsten Reef Mines Co., all asking for the tariff of \$10 a unit. Yet the gentleman says that I did not state the fact when I stated that the producers of ore asked for the very tariff written in this bill, because, he says, only one man interested asked for it. So I repeat that the producers did demand before our committee the \$10 a unit tariff and that the Republican members put their demands in the bill without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t."

Mr. GREEN in his speech declared that in preparing this bill instead of taking the testimony of interested witnesses they had the Tariff Commission report before them, that in preparing the bill they had Mr. Riddell's testimony before them, and that by such report and by such testimony they prepared the bill. Gentlemen, here is the bill and the report of the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission did not report until June 14. No Member saw it before then. Yet the bill carry-

ing out to the letter the demands of its beneficiaries—the tungsten-ore producers—was introduced on June 2, 12 days before the Tariff Commission had even reported. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object, because objection was made to giving Mr. TREADWAY more time.

Mr. TREADWAY. I hope the gentleman from Minnesota will not object, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Texas sees now how it works out. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to speak for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, they said in preparing this bill that they took Mr. Riddell's testimony. The bill was prepared and introduced with the exact rates which it now contains 10 days before Mr. Riddell appeared before the committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.] His testimony was given on June 13. Here is the bill, \$10 a unit for ore, \$1 a pound for the metallic tungsten, introduced on June 2, 11 days before they knew there was such a man living as Riddell. They only took disinterested testimony they say. Riddell's testimony shows that he took his opinion as to the rates from what the manufacturers wanted and what they told him they wanted. He said that is what the manufacturers claimed they ought to have to protect themselves.

The Tariff Commission's report does not justify this bill, nor is there a word or a line in the Tariff Commission's report that states that there should be \$10 a unit on ore, or \$1 a pound on the ferrotungsten; not one word. And yet they would have the House and country believe that this bill was proposed on the Tariff Commission's report and Riddell's testimony. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] said that he was going to answer the statements which I challenged the Republicans to deny. Not an answer or denial of any of them did he make, because he could not answer or deny them. Neither did Mr. FORDNEY. Instead of denying or answering what I said and letting this House know of the outrageously high and excessive rates in the bill, why, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] made a discourse of 31 minutes on the tariff on lemons and the lawsuit on lemons five years ago. What did lemons and the lawsuit have to do with tungsten ore and this bill? Both the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] talked about everything except the bill—not one word about the bill. Neither denied the statements I made though challenged day before yesterday and to-day to deny any one of them. Why? Because they could not answer or deny them. They did not want you Republicans here to know what is in their bill, so they talked on subjects not connected with the bill. Then Mr. MONDELL, the majority leader, recognizing that if these new Members knew what was in this bill, that if the Members on that side who did not know the old ring and machine were informed of these rates and their effect, if they were convinced that what I said of the bill was true, they could not vote for it, take the floor or to divert their minds from the bill, and without referring to a line or word on the bill, without mentioning what the rates are, without mentioning what huge increases the bill makes, or the monopoly it serves, delivered a beautiful declamation on Bourbonism for 20 minutes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I said in my remarks Tuesday that not a Republican member of the committee or of the House knew how much 60 per cent tungsten ore it takes to make a ton of tungsten or ferrotungsten. I paused to give them time to answer, and not one answered. I declared then, as I do now, that no man can tell whether a dollar a pound on tungsten or ferrotungsten is a proper or just compensatory duty unless he knows how much 60 per cent tungsten ore it takes to make a pound or ton of ferrotungsten, because that duty is supposed to be levied for the purpose of compensating for the duty levied on tungsten ore. But since Tuesday some one presuming to know more about it than the Republican members of the committee and the House has undertaken to tell them. So this morning they come in here and say that it takes 2½ tons of tungsten 60 per cent ore to make a ton of tungsten or ferrotungsten. This is not correct. According to Mr. McKenna's testimony, it takes 4,167 pounds of such ore to make a ton of ferrotungsten; that is a fraction over 2 tons. But where is the Tariff Board report? Turn to page 36 of the Tariff Commission's report. It states that it takes only 2 tons of 60 per cent tungsten ore to make 1 ton of ferrotungsten.

The Geological Survey, the War Industries Board, and the Department of Commerce agree on the 2 tons of ore for 1 ton

of ferrotungsten. So then, that being true, just as I said—I gave it the benefit of 100 pounds in my statement day before yesterday—if it takes 2 tons of tungsten ore to make 1 ton of ferrotungsten, then this compensatory duty, instead of being \$2,000 a ton, ought only to be \$1,200 a ton, or 60 cents a pound, and this bill with this joker of \$1 a pound gives to the tungsten manufacturer a clear extra \$800 a ton. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and section be now closed.

Mr. KITCHIN. One minute; I desire to offer an amendment. The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is now closed. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KITCHIN: Page 1, line 8, after the word "First," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof "tungsten-bearing ores of all kinds, 10 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. KITCHIN. That is the exact language of the Payne-Aldrich Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 89, yeas 97.

Mr. KITCHIN. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. FORDNEY and Mr. GARNER took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 102, yeas 104.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment that I wish to offer there.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KITCHIN: Page 1, line 8, after the word "First," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof: "tungsten-bearing ores of all kinds, 20 per cent ad valorem."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 104, yeas 109.

Mr. KITCHIN. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. FORDNEY and Mr. GARNER took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 113, yeas 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Second. Metallic tungsten, tungsten powder, ferrotungsten (lump and pulverized), ferrotungsten powder, commercial tungstic acid, calcium tungstate, sodium tungstate, and all other salts of tungsten and other manufactured materials containing tungsten, including high-speed tungsten steel, all alloy steels containing tungsten, and all other compounds containing tungsten not specifically provided for in this section, \$1 per pound of tungsten contained therein.

Mr. KITCHIN, Mr. FORDNEY, Mr. DEWALT, and Mr. GREEN of Iowa rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first recognize the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have an amendment to offer, but I wish to offer it as a new section. If the gentleman from North Carolina has an amendment to the section, I will withhold my amendment.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have an amendment to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KITCHIN: Page 2, line 3, after the word "Second," strike out all of the paragraph and insert:

"Tungsten, tungsten powder, ferrotungsten (lump and pulverized), and ferrotungsten powder, 20 per cent ad valorem."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to debate that.

Mr. KITCHIN. I object to striking out the last word. The gentleman can talk on the amendment.

Mr. FORDNEY. All right. The amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] practically puts all grades of tungsten on the same basis and under the same

rate of duty. That would in no sense be a fair provision of law. But any amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is intended to destroy the effect of this bill reported by the Republicans. I warn you gentlemen of the House to that effect. He has no purpose whatever other than to destroy a Republican measure. But to put the same rate of duty on a low-grade ore that is imposed on high-grade ore is not common sense, let alone being just and equitable.

In committee the gentleman opposed any rate of duty on tungsten ore or on tungsten metal. I wish to repeat to the gentlemen of the House that tungsten is one of the most important metals in use in the land this minute, and most important because it is used in making high-speed steel, which steel makes it possible to speed up the work in constructing ships, locomotives, and machinery of every description.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. It is also used in the tools that are necessary for turning out the cannon and other war material that this country requires.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. High-speed tool steel is made possible only by the use of tungsten. The Government, recognizing the extreme importance of tungsten, encouraged its production in America during the war by proposing to use a portion of the \$50,000,000 appropriation for the encouragement of the production of certain so-called war minerals that were much needed and which we could not get abroad. Let me say to some of you gentlemen, who may not have been here a few minutes ago and heard what I said about the fluctuating price of tungsten, that it was shown by an expert who appeared before the committee that tungsten ore, 60 per cent metallic content, can be and is now being furnished to the English Government from some of their colonies at \$1.92 a unit, whereas the producers in this country who began the industry during the war to help out our Government, to help win this war, closed their mines and their factories when the price went down to \$17 a unit. That indicates the difference in the cost of production in this country and abroad. The mines from which tungsten ore is taken to-day in the United States, as I now remember it, as expert testimony taken by our committee shows, contain tungsten in veins averaging about 4 inches thick, and a very large amount of rock must be taken from the earth to give space for the miners to work in and get that tungsten ore, whereas in China, whence a large portion of the tungsten ore comes now, it is picked up largely from the surface by unskilled labor.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And as the gentleman is aware, the price for it now, put down in New York, is from \$6 to \$8 per unit, and this amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina would probably allow it to be sold for \$8 per unit.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. Tungsten is sold in this country for \$7 a unit. It was sold for \$90 during the war, when we were obliged to go to foreign countries for what we needed.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have given very little consideration to the details of this legislation, but I think there is a misapprehension as to what the effect of the section before us will be on the industry. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], if I understand his amendment correctly, proposes, instead of a specific rate of duty, that we shall have a 20 per cent ad valorem rate. Now, if I understand the effect of an ad valorem rate of 20 per cent on the price of the commodity, it would mean \$1,800 a ton in some instances, whereas the specific rate proposed by the committee and carried in this section of the bill would not carry more than \$1,000 a ton. I wonder if I am right?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman wish to inquire of the committee?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is right in one way and in another way he is not. The effect of this amendment, which is entirely inconsistent with the first paragraph of the bill, would be to wipe out not only the provisions of the second section, which he proposes to strike out, but it would also wipe out certain provisions of the first section. The first section levies a rate of about \$600 per ton on tungstic trioxide. The gentleman is mixing up the ore and the concentrated product so much that it is impossible to state it in a few minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. At any rate, it would run it up as high as \$1,800 a ton, whereas in no case would it run beyond \$1,000 under the provision of the bill.

Gentlemen, let us understand the purpose of the gentleman from North Carolina. His purpose is to embarrass the situation. He is a free-trade Democrat. He does not believe in



protecting American industry for American workingmen or American capital. We believe that American industry should be protected and developed by Americans. [Applause on the Republican side.] He, on the other hand, believes in a tariff for revenue only, without any incidental protection whatever. He does not care where the material comes from, even though it may be produced by Chinese or Japanese labor at the expense of American labor. We do. We want to employ American labor at American wages. [Applause on the Republican side.] We want to develop American industry by American hands and American capital, and he would put into competition with these men in America the underpaid labor of India, of Japan, of China, anywhere in all the world.

Why, when we were considering the Underwood bill I asked Mr. UNDERWOOD, the able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means then, if certain things happened what would become of American industry, and he said he was not concerned and neither was the Democratic Party concerned about American industry. They were concerned in opening the markets of America to competition with the world. We, as Republicans, are in favor of maintaining the American market for America and Americans. That is the difference. [Applause on the Republican side.]

So that you must not misunderstand the attitude of the gentleman from North Carolina. We must realize that we speak for one element of progress, and that element is America, while he speaks for an element represented by Woodrow Wilson, called "world humanity." We are not interested in it. [Applause on the Republican side.] We are interested in America and Americans, and we are for America first, and for the development of its industries and the maintenance of its prosperity and the happiness of its people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak to the amendment.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman favors the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, of course we are all delighted, at all times, to hear gentlemen on the other side of the aisle proclaiming their great interest in the protection of American labor. Permit me to say that I come from a State having at least ten millions of inhabitants, largely industrial, and probably embracing as many laboring men to the square mile as any other portion of the United States.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania. And they vote for protection.

Mr. DEWALT. Permit me also to say that I yield to no man on either side of the House in my desire to protect American labor against unfair competition and the cheap labor of foreign climes. [Applause.] In so far as that goes, I am a protectionist, but I never will be a protectionist for a particular class and for a particular section. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The great trouble in this proposition, at this time, seems to be that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are more concerned in the welfare of a particular State and the mines in that State producing tungsten than they are concerned in the prosperity of the entire Union. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Is the reason for that concern this, that in 1920 that particular State will be a pivotal State, and they are now electioneering for the vote of that Commonwealth? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SNYDER. We will get it all right.

Mr. DEWALT. Permit me to say that this is entirely, in my judgment, what you call local legislation. Let me show you. The very report in itself shows that there were 22 companies formerly producing this material; that they had \$2,000,000 invested in tungsten mines and \$1,000,000 in 21 concentrating mills; and that the entire revenue which could be obtained by this tariff would amount to only \$1,800,000. I come from a district where there are in one manufacturing establishment of finished steel products 30,000 workmen instead of 5,000. [Applause.] I come from a district where there are at least 230,000 people working in the steel mills, the cement mills, and in the factories producing the other products which go into the prosperity of this country, and gentlemen on that side of the aisle propose now to legislate for a pocket-borough State, having a population less than one-fifth of that of Pennsylvania, and to protect an industry that is employing only 5,000 men. It seems to me then, my friends, that it comes with very poor grace on the part of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to proclaim his loyalty and his devotion to American labor. [Applause.] Why does he not talk about the American labor of Illinois? Why does he not talk about the American labor of Pennsylvania and its protection?

Mr. VAILE. Let me suggest to the gentleman that the Members on this side of the House believe in local legislation of a sort that can be supported in any part of the United States, not in local legislation that some Democratic Member may support for his own district. [Applause.]

Mr. DEWALT. I never saw a more flat contradiction of that statement than there is in this very bill itself. [Applause.] The very report shows that you are legislating for only 5,000 workmen, that you are legislating for only 22 manufacturing establishments, and that the revenue you get from it will be the meager sum of \$1,800,000, while the tax you put on the steel industry, taking your own figures of 15 cents per ton, taking the thousands of millions of tons of steel products that are manufactured in this country, would amount to a thousand times more than your \$1,800,000.

Mr. VAILE. Let me ask the gentleman if he is speaking for his side of the House, or only for himself, when he advocates the protection only of industries which are large?

Mr. DEWALT. I think I am speaking for the general public welfare, as I always try to do, against private interests and monopoly. [Applause.] And I assert here—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEWALT. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWALT. And I assert, after listening to the discussion on both sides of the aisle in reference to this bill, that it shows upon the face of it that it must have been conceived, promulgated, and used entirely for the interest of this particular industry. Now, if this was an infant industry, if this was an industry that spread its efforts all over the United States, if various portions of the country needed this particular protection, I would be glad to vote for a bill of this kind within reasonable limits; but when they propose to put a tariff tax upon a product of this kind, when it is shown clearly that only 5,000 people are engaged in it, and that only 22 manufacturing establishments are producing it, and that the revenue to be obtained by the tax on the foreign product will be only \$1,800,000, and in the same breath they determine to raise this tariff to at least three times as much or twice as much as the Payne-Aldrich tariff, then I, as a citizen of Pennsylvania and as a citizen of the Union, protest against the iniquity and inequality thereof. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, my fellow Republicans, the new ones especially [laughter], all those who do not know the old ring as well as I do, let me ask you, have you not got sense enough to know that Mr. FORDNEY and Mr. MADDEN and every other gentleman who has spoken on this floor against this amendment knows absolutely that this bill is without merit? Have you heard them mention this bill? Have you heard any of them discuss a single provision of this bill? Has any one of them told you of the huge increase of the tariff in this bill over any tariff that was ever written into a bill? Have you heard a single one of them tell what the equivalent ad valorem of these rates would be, or how it would increase the price, or whether the industry "protected" in the bill is a monopoly or not, or where a monopoly is going to get the whole benefit of this bill, or how much it will add to the costs of the steel tools, or how much money is going to be taken from the people by the bill and given to the "big four"? But as an argument on the merits of the bill Mr. FORDNEY says, "Fellow Republicans, you ought not to vote for this amendment because a Democrat offers it, and if you vote for this amendment you will be killing"—not a just bill, not a righteous bill, not a fair bill, but—"a Republican bill." [Applause.] And Mr. MADDEN tells you that this amendment comes from "Mr. KITCHIN, a free trader." Mr. FORDNEY and Mr. MADDEN tell you that the amendment is unjust without knowing what it is. They only know that a "Democrat offers it." They tell you that this amendment is unfair. Ah, gentlemen, I never expected to hear Mr. FORDNEY or Mr. MADDEN come before the House and denounce as unjust or unfair any part of the Payne-Aldrich Act. This amendment of mine is an exact copy of the Payne Act itself with respect to this industry. [Laughter.] Now, do you mean to say that the Payne Act provision was unjust, was unfair, was a sham, and that it ought to be voted out because Democrats now present it for your consideration and vote? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman vote for this bill if this amendment carries?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will vote for this bill if this amendment and the others putting in the provisions of the Payne act pass. I will not vote for this bill with this amendment alone, but I propose, as I told you this morning, to offer amendments putting the Payne Act rates in every one of these sections in lieu of the rates now in them. Yes; I will vote for this bill if you restore the Payne Act rates. [Applause.] Because they are five times better than the bill as it is. Now, let me ask you, if this amendment and other amendments carry, which put back the Payne Act rates just as you then voted, just as Mr. FORDNEY voted, and just as the other Republicans voted when it was enacted, will you repudiate these rates and provisions of the Payne Act, or will you vote with me for them? [Applause.] What will you do? Approve or repudiate?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Answer!

Mr. KITCHIN. I told you they did not know anything about the Payne tariff. I told you they did not know anything about this bill. They just took what the manufacturers wanted, in the Payne Act as in this bill. Mr. FORDNEY and Mr. MONDELL and Mr. MADDEN and these other Republicans did not know that my amendment was the Payne Act provision exactly. [Applause and laughter on Democratic side.] But it must be repudiated, however, because it comes from me, a Democrat. If it had come from Mr. Payne, they would say that it was a model of perfection. They did not know anything about the Payne Act when they voted for it. They did exactly as they are doing now. They did what the manufacturers throughout the country ordered them to do, just like they are doing what four corporations demand on this bill. [Applause and laughter on Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY says that my amendment is unjust because it is an ad valorem rate. The Payne Act was an ad valorem rate exactly like this amendment, "20 per cent ad valorem." Mr. MADDEN says that an ad valorem rate puts a higher tax upon it than a specific tax. This ad valorem tariff of the Payne Act proposed in my amendment will put a tariff tax equal to \$226 a ton, and the specific tariff proposed in this bill before you put a tariff tax of \$2,000 a ton, and this in addition to the 15 per cent tariff. Here is a chance for you Republicans to do a fair and just thing. He says that you ought to vote against my amendment because it will raise the tax, and vote for their bill because it will lower the tax. You are asked, therefore, to vote for the lower tax. If you do you will vote for my amendment, for the rate, the tax in the bill, is over 800 per cent or over nine times higher than the rate or tax in my amendment, which is the Payne rate on tons. This tariff bill which they report is twice as high as any bill that was ever presented by a committee to this House since the very beginning of the Government, and I defy any Republican to deny it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FESS rose.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio be permitted to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman who has just left the floor [Mr. KITCHIN] is not only facetious but the inconsistency of the position that he took in 1909 and in 1913 with the position that he is taking now is sufficient to call attention to it. In 1909 he harangued the House with all of the power of his forensic ability against the Payne law. In 1913 he went upon the floor of the House with all of the power that he possessed, advocated superseding the Payne law by the Underwood law, which, of course, did away with all of the protection on this item that was in the Payne law, and now he comes on the floor of the House following the Republican idea and undertakes to cover it up by saying that because the Republican side of the House voted for it in 1909 and against the Underwood law in 1913 they ought now to accept it because he offers it in 1919. That shows the consistency of the position that he has taken. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] says that he is for protection when it is nation-wide, but not for protection when it is local. Let me say to the gentleman that when he votes to protect an article, no matter how limited it is in its geography, in its production, which is used universally in its application, it ceases to be a local interest and becomes a nation-wide interest. The gentleman goes on to say that he will not stand for this bill because it applies to a small interest. Let me say to the gentleman—

Mr. DEWALT rose.

Mr. FESS. I can not yield now. Let me say to my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], speaking as he says he does for the steel industry of his famous district—one of the greatest districts in the United States—that the steel industry in the

State for which he speaks is what it is now because of the genius of the protective tariff which put the steel industry on its feet in America. [Applause on the Republican side.] And he did not stand for it then. To-day when the steel industry has gotten to the position where it does not need any particular legislation to support it, the gentleman comes and admits that he would be for protection if it was for a large production like the steel of the country, but he will not be for it if it is for tungsten that comes from some particular locality. Let me say to my friend from Pennsylvania, speaking as he does, insinuating that this legislation is to win the State of Colorado for the Republican side of the House, that that job has already been done. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is no necessity for anything of that sort. I rise simply to say this, that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] specifically differentiate between the Republican policy and the Democratic policy by their speaking for tungsten in the interest of the labor of China, Bolivia, and Portugal, the countries that are in competition with America, and that we speak not for Colorado alone but for the United States of America, in order to maintain American standard of wages and American standard of living as against European competition. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this amendment now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

The question was taken.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed Mr. FORDNEY and Mr. GARNER to act as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 118, noes 140.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman has another amendment, I will withhold mine until he can offer his.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KITCHIN: Page 2, line 3, after the word "Second," strike out all of the paragraph and insert: "Tungsten, tungsten powder, ferrotungsten (lump and pulverized), and ferrotungsten powder, 25 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes on this amendment. I did not know that debate was closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, since it appeared in the discussion of my last amendment that the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee and of the House knew nothing about the Payne Act and its provisions and its rates, I want to inform them that the amendment now proposed by me, with the rate of the existing law, exactly doubles the Payne Act rate on ferrotungsten and tungsten. The existing law on tungsten and articles covered in section 2 is 15 per cent. I now offer an amendment to add to that 25 per cent, which makes 40 per cent, and that is twice as high as the Payne Act rate. Even this high rate is less than one-fourth as high as the rate or tariff in the bill before us. I am giving by this amendment a chance for the Republicans to show some respect for the general interest rather than bestow it all on the special interests.

I want to say if the Republicans of this House are willing to vote for a rate twice as high as the Payne rate, and the Republican leaders and machine here ask you to vote against it, they admit that the rate in the bill before you is, as I said, many times—over nine times—higher than the Payne Act rate. The rate of the bill, as I have frequently stated, is \$2,000 a ton, plus the 15 per cent duty under existing law, while in 1911, 1912, and 1913, under the Payne Act, the rate was 20 per cent ad valorem, which made it, at normal prices prevailing, equivalent to \$226 a ton, as against \$2,169 a ton, being the \$2,000 per ton specific duty—\$1 per pound—plus the 15 per cent ad valorem, which equals \$169 per ton. Now, I make the Payne rate double. This will be 40 per cent, or the equivalent, on basis of the normal price, of \$452 per ton. I call attention again to the fact that no Re-



publican who has entered this discussion has referred to the provisions of this bill or to its rates or to its operation. But the House machine call in all of the old-time political war horses and snap the lash over the heads of these new Members and intimidate them into voting for this outrage. They had a committee, an able and distinguished committee, which ought to have been intelligent and patriotic enough to take care of this bill on the floor if it was worthy of being taken care of.

First they put the author of the bill up, and he is the only Republican who has discussed the bill. He made as fine an explanation of and argument for it as could be made for such a bill. Then they called upon the chairman, who is not interested in this one way or the other, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, one of the most influential Members here, one of the most partisan Members here, and he appealed to you on the ground not that this bill was right or just but that this was a "Republican bill" reported out by a "Republican committee," and that Republicans of the House ought not to let Democrats kill or amend it. Then they called upon the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MONDELL], who did not discuss the bill, and for good reasons—he knew absolutely nothing about the bill or any of its provisions. The only thing he knew was that it was a "Republican bill." That was not sufficient. After the speeches of Mr. MONDELL and Mr. FORDNEY a vote was taken on an amendment and it stood 104 to 102. They sent then over to the headquarters of the Republican congressional committee and brought in the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], the chairman of the Republican national congressional committee, and had him appeal to all Republicans to save a "Republican bill" from being destroyed or changed by a Democratic amendment. Not that my amendment was not right, not that my amendment was not just, not that my amendment was not the proper and patriotic thing, but that my amendment was proposed by a Democrat against a "Republican bill." Gentlemen, this amendment is twice as high as the Payne Act rate. Now, let us see how you will vote on that.

I desire to call attention to one remark of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. That remark was this: "Why," he said, "the difference between our party and the Democratic Party is that we have legislated for the American laborer, while they want to legislate for the foreign Chinese laborer," and so forth. Remember, my amendment, which called forth this partisan ebullition, was exactly the Payne Act provision. I will say to the gentleman that if my amendment legislates against American labor in favor of Chinese labor, then the Republican Party has the honor of preceding the Democrats 10 years in legislating against the American laborer in favor of the Chinese and foreign laborer when in 1909 it passed the very provision contained in my amendment. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, in my remarks of a few moments ago gentlemen may have understood me to refer to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] as a Bourbon. I referred to a Bourbon as one who never learns. Well, I shall have to modify that a little, if it is to be assumed I included the gentleman from North Carolina in my reference. The gentleman from North Carolina, it seems, is not such a Bourbon as I may have thought he was. He does learn a little. The truth is, he learns slowly and does not keep up with the progress of truth and the march of events. He was against the Payne-Aldrich bill and denounced all of its provisions as the sum of all iniquities. He has now advanced to the point where he at least offers an amendment for a tariff rate which he says is twice as high as the Payne-Aldrich rate, which, in his opinion, was anathema. So the gentleman has progressed. The Democratic leader has moved forward just a little. The trouble with him is that he has not come to a full understanding of the truth. In the days of the Payne-Aldrich bill we had not learned, any of us, of the importance of these key industries; we had not, any of us, realized the unfortunate condition of the country in time of war with a monopoly of essential elements in the hands of the enemy, and so in the Payne bill we placed on tungsten not a rate intended to develop the American industry to a point to make it commanding and Nation supplying but rather a small but somewhat encouraging rate. But we have learned something during the war, on our side, and I trust that the gentlemen on that side have, if their leaders have not, and that is that as to the essential elements and industries America must be made independent of all the world.

[Applause on the Republican side.] We must prepare to protect ourselves from foreign monopoly and against the day when, if foreign nations shall withhold from us those things needful for our very existence, we shall have developed them within our own borders to an extent to enable us to become independent of all the world. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is what this rate means. Not what the comparatively low rate of the Payne bill meant, simply reasonable encouragement to an American industry to allow it to continue to exist in a limited way, but a rate, based on the judgment of those who know best of the conditions to be met, calculated to make America largely independent of all the world in these elements and in these lines of production as we hope before we conclude our labors to make her similarly independent in other essential lines. [Applause on the Republican side and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate on this amendment be closed in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has already been closed.

Mr. FORDNEY. I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen on this side also have five minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I object to both requests; let us vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Do not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made to both requests. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Division, Mr. Speaker. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. FORDNEY and Mr. GARNER took their places as tellers.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 120, yeas 137. So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is an amendment in the shape of a new section.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have another amendment I wish to offer.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I thought the gentleman was through. I withdraw my amendment for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KITCHIN: Page 2, line 10, strike out "\$1" and insert in lieu thereof "62½ cents."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KITCHIN. One minute, Mr. Chairman. Do the gentlemen want any explanation of that? [Cries of "No!" "No!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, a division; and I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 114, yeas 138.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the form of a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Page 2, after line 10, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 2. That there shall be levied, assessed, and collected upon all tungsten ore and concentrates which have been imported prior to the passage of this act from any foreign country and held or kept within the United States, when such ore has been purchased by the owner thereof at a price less than \$17 per unit of tungsten trioxide therein contained, a tax equal to the difference between the purchase price so paid by the owner and the price named above in this section."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak a word in explanation of the amendment. This amendment is satisfactory to the members of the committee on this side, and I think will be satisfactory to the members of the committee on the other side, although I have not heard them express any opinion with reference to it.

The committee will remember that there has been much said with reference to the amount of ore which was already held in stock at New York, especially by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] with reference to \$3,000,000 being made

by the owners thereof. I undertook to show, and think I did show, that the owners would not make anything, but might possibly recoup their loss. In any event, this amendment would take care of that situation.

And there is also another situation that should be taken care of. It will probably be some time before this bill will pass the Senate. Ore is coming in here now—at least offered for sale—at the rate of about \$7 or \$8, and I think there has been a claim that some ore has been offered as low as \$6 per unit of tungsten trioxide laid down at New York. The effect of this bill, as the committee intended it, will be to bring the price up to about \$17 per unit, which is the lowest price, under the testimony, at which the American operators could produce it. Under my amendment these men that have these large stocks on hand, if they bought it for less than \$17 per unit, will be compelled to pay a tax on the difference between what they paid for it and \$17, and there will be no object in trying to ship in, as doubtless otherwise there would be imported, large quantities of the ore at somewhere from \$6 to \$8 a unit, with the hope of making the difference between that and the rate in this bill during the time this bill was pending. That is the object of the amendment, and I think there will be no objection thereto.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman states that it will probably be some time before this bill is passed by the Senate. How long does he think it will be before it is signed by the President?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It depends on whether the President adheres to his message, which he recently sent us, in which he called attention to matters of this kind—these war minerals—and said that they ought to be protected. I have high hopes that the President, as well as some of the gentlemen on the other side, is learning as the time goes on.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman knows there is not any chance on earth of the President signing this bill, and, of course, the gentleman, as well as that side, knows it will not be passed by a two-thirds vote over his veto. So why are we consuming so much time in the consideration of these popgun bills when everybody knows there is not the slightest chance of any of them becoming law?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. May I ask, then, why the other side is taking so much time?

Mr. LITTLE. Perhaps the gentleman from Oklahoma could tell us whether the President would sign the bill if we would double the Payne tariff rates?

Mr. GARNER. The testimony before us showed, so far as the consumption of this country is concerned, that there is only three years' supply in existence in this country.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is simply making a statement. He is like the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], who said we did not deny certain statements, although it was proven over and over again in the hearings that they were not correct.

Mr. GARNER. I think the gentleman will find from the Bureau of Mines the testimony that the amount in sight now would be sufficient to run this country for three years, but that they hoped and believed in the course of the production of this ore a great deal more of it would be discovered. And I think that is a reasonable hypothesis. I think this Government itself ought to buy and own a certain amount of this ore in case of an emergency. I think it ought to have it in this country, and own it and have it laid away and stored in case of war or emergency, because it is just possible, if not probable, that in this country this tungsten ore will be exhausted, and unless we erect the industry ourselves and have some of that article in case of emergency we may be caught where we can not get this tungsten at all.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think that will occur at all. In that connection I want to refer to a statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] repeatedly. He said that nobody denied that this bill would create a monopoly. His own statement shows that it could not create a monopoly. One firm have produced in the past 25 per cent, another 60 per cent, or something of that kind, but those concerns are not producing at that rate now. There are hundreds of little producers that make up a large proportion of what is produced, and if this bill passes we put the rate so low that at least one-half of it will come from abroad. And as to the Payne tariff rates one might as well talk about the rates before the Civil War, conditions are so different. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman from Iowa offered this amendment. I shall not oppose this amendment, because I am certain that this bill will pass just as the manufacturers want it and just as the Republicans reported it out of the committee. This amendment would improve the bill. If we were not certain that you are going to pass the bill in this House this proposition standing alone would be a shame and injustice; but as the bill is, it betters it to some extent.

Here is the gratification that I have over the introduction of the amendment: It is an admission of the truth of what I said the other day. If my statement was not true it would not be necessary to have this amendment and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] would not have introduced it.

Dr. Hess, of the Geological Survey, testified before our committee, and it was not denied by anybody then, and it has not been denied by anybody since, that there had been imported by four firms in New York 4,500 tons of ore, most of it from China, and that it was stored and held there now; that the producers in this country had stored 1,500 tons. I said that if this bill were passed it would at once advance the price of that ore \$600 per ton and would put into the pockets of these four importers by such advance \$2,700,000; that it would increase the value or price of the 1,500 tons held by the producers \$900,000 and they would pocket that amount extra. I challenged then and to-day a denial. No denial has been forthcoming, but an admission in the shape of this amendment.

The gentleman recognized that that would be the result of this bill, and this amendment is offered to keep those importers or other importers who imported at \$8 or \$9 or \$10 per unit from making the extra \$600 a ton which this bill otherwise would give. They would not have offered this amendment if I had not called their attention to that fact. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] asserted awhile ago that I had made statements that were "disproved by the hearings time and time again." It is mighty easy to make statements, gentlemen, but it is mighty hard to prove them when you are face to face with the other fellow and he has all the evidence in his hand. I challenge the gentleman right now to restate one statement that I made, and then point to one line or word in the Tariff Commission report, or one line or word in all the hearings, from any of the witnesses that disproves a single statement I made. I challenge him to do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why, the gentleman could not even state the rate of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill correctly, and he can not state it now.

Mr. KITCHIN. What was the rate? Tell it if you know.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Twenty-five per cent on any under \$200 and 20 per cent on any over \$200.

Mr. KITCHIN. That was on tungsten and ferrotungsten. We were just discussing ore, but just think what a stickler the gentleman is! The Payne Act did read so, because the McKinley Act or the Dingley Act made such a distinction. It did read that all tungsten or ferrotungsten valued at \$200 per ton or under would bear 25 per cent duty, and all valued at over \$200 per ton should bear 20 per cent duty. Now, there has not been one single ton or pound of tungsten or ferrotungsten imported in this country in the last 20 years that was valued at less than \$200 per ton. The gentleman should know it. He can not show me from the statistics where a ton or a pound of tungsten or ferrotungsten has come in at less than \$200. If he can show that I will promise to vote for this bill. But it is not there.

As I said, the gentleman did not know that no tungsten or ferrotungsten was valued at \$200 or less. He did not know that the 25 per cent on tungsten or ferrotungsten had been a dead and useless provision in the act ever since it was passed, because if he had it would be foolish in the face of a knowledge of the facts to have made such an assertion; but he did not know any better. [Laughter.] So that the real tariff rate under the Payne Act was just as I said it was, 20 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, if the gentleman has any other instance wherein he is willing to allege that I made a misstatement, I challenge him now to declare it. I pause for him to do so. He declines because he knows every statement I made on Tuesday and I have made to-day in respect to this bill is absolutely true. [Applause on the Democratic side, and cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the provisions of this act shall not be deemed to repeal any tariff now existing upon any substances or materials mentioned in this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] to the fact that the amendment just adopted was a new section and numbered 2. The section we are now considering in the bill is No. 2, and it is necessary, therefore, to change it.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the present section be numbered 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.



The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORDNEY: On page 2, line 11, after the word "Section," strike out the figure "2" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "3."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KITCHIN: Page 2, line 3, strike out all of section 3 and insert as section 3 "That the provisions of any act inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed."

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the amendment I propose strikes out the provision in the bill which makes the tariff rates in the bill an addition to the existing duty under the present law on tungsten and ferrotungsten, and so forth. The duty is now 15 per cent, and this provision is so written in the bill that that duty remains, and if the bill becomes a law we will have both the existing of 15 per cent and the exorbitant duties in the bill. That is, we will have the tariff of \$2,000 a ton on ferrotungsten and tungsten provided in the bill, plus 15 per cent ad valorem. This amendment is to strike out section 3 containing the provision and insert in lieu thereof the usual section repealing the provisions of any law inconsistent with this bill, so as to give its beneficiaries only the \$2,000 per ton robbery. This alone amounts to over 175 per cent.

Gentlemen of the committee, in a few minutes we are going to vote on this bill. It is going to pass. All Democrats shall vote against it. Before the vote on the bill I shall offer an amendment to recommit, striking out these rates and submitting the Payne-Aldrich Act rates, which will test your loyalty to that act. The day before yesterday and this morning I made the statement, and I repeat it now, that this bill gives \$5,000,000 annually to four corporations which have a monopoly of the industry. Not a man has denied it and not one can deny it. I have dared one to deny it. I charged that this bill imposed a duty upon ore 1,100 per cent higher than the Payne Act—twelve times as high. I challenged them to deny it. They did not deny it. They could not deny it. They do not deny it now. I challenged that on tungsten and ferrotungsten the rate was over 800 per cent higher than the Payne rate—over nine times as high. I challenged the Republicans to deny it. Not one has denied or does deny it. I stated that this bill would give the importers of the 4,500 tons which are stored in this country, and the producers here who have 1,500 tons stored, a direct gift of \$3,700,000. That statement has been partially admitted by the amendment of my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

I charged that this bill taxes all users of tungsten steel \$5,000,000 a year, that it takes out of the pockets of the people and puts into the pockets of a monopoly of four enriched corporations \$5,000,000 annually. I challenged denial. Not one has denied or does deny it. The Republicans to-day have to a man voted for it.

Gentlemen, we all vividly recall the memorable contest which took place on this floor a few weeks ago, a contest which, it seemed, unfortunately became a party or partisan one. The President in a veto message complained that Congress had not provided sufficient funds for the rehabilitation work for our disabled soldiers, and asked Congress for a larger appropriation than had been granted for this purpose. In quick response to the President's appeal and the needs of our crippled soldier boys, the Democrats proposed an appropriation of \$12,000,000, the amount needed. The Republicans at once, almost to a man—every leader among them—protested against this amount as extravagant, and "in the interest of economy" proposed an appropriation of only \$8,000,000. They preferred to make an "economy record" than to properly care for the needs of our helpless, disabled soldiers. Mr. FORDNEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MONDELL, the majority leader; Mr. MADDEN, Dr. FESS, chairman of the Republican congressional committee, and other Republicans, who to-day are moving heaven and earth to tax the people \$5,000,000 a year for the benefit not of the Government but a commercial monopoly, together with practically every Republican in the House, protested against, fought against, and voted against giving the additional \$4,000,000 to the poor, wounded, disabled, and crippled soldier boys to help them make their lives worth the living. [Applause.] That protest, that fight, that vote in the interest of "Republican economy!"

I am glad and proud to recall that while the Republicans lined up almost to a man against that appropriation for the disabled boys from the trenches the Democrats to a man voted for it.

Oh, yes; the Republican leaders and ringsters of the House, who are now swinging and popping the party lash in this Chamber, whipping into line every Republican Member for the pending bill, could not then "in the interest of economy" appropriate \$4,000,000 to help our maimed and crippled hero boys—the boys who, while in the trenches struggling to maintain the rights and honor of our country, had their legs shot off, had their arms shot off, had their eyes shot out! [Applause on Democratic side.]

But to-day when the special interests demand that these same Republicans tax the people—take out of the pockets of the people \$5,000,000 a year and put it into the pockets of this enriched monopoly—of four corporations, as this bill does—not a Republican voice is raised against it, but every Republican in the House, amid applause and cheers, is voting for that monstrous proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina has laid great stress upon the action of a number of Republicans in not supporting what he says was the recommendation of the President for \$4,000,000 additional for the vocational training of the young men coming back from the war. The fact is the Republicans supported the President in giving the full amount of \$8,000,000 recommended by him. No Republican opposed that appropriation because he was opposed to the system or because he wished in any degree to cripple that splendid undertaking. But the friends of that measure had said that we had already given them more money than they could use in the coming year, and knowing full well that Congress, being in session all the time, could supply any amount they wanted, they did not feel the necessity of voting more money than was necessary at that time. I wish to say to gentlemen that it is the purpose of the majority upon this side to provide some way whereby these boys who are coming back from the other side and taking their places in civil life again shall be protected in their honest endeavors against the cheap labor of Europe. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not yield. I have only five minutes. I wish to say that the same argument has been brought forward here to-day against this tungsten industry that was brought forward a few years ago when some enterprising and patriotic gentlemen sought to manufacture tin in the United States. It was said that it could not be manufactured, that it could not be found, that it would not benefit a thousand people in all the United States. That is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] has said with reference to this tungsten industry. Yet the Republican Party under the leadership of that great protectionist and patriot, William McKinley [applause], put a tariff upon tin. And what was the result? We found we had plenty of it here within our own borders, and to-day we are manufacturing it more cheaply than any other country on the face of the earth, and to-day we are the greatest manufacturers of tin in all the world. [Applause.] That was due, if you please, to the protective-tariff policy of the Republican Party.

And I wish to call the attention of some of you southern gentlemen to the situation existing in your own country, where protection is needed for development more than in any other section of the United States. Before we got into this war a number of gentlemen, Members of this House, while in the State of Texas discovered that in all that country where previously there had been a great many sugar mills running only a few years ago, when the protective tariff was upon the sugar industry sufficient to warrant the manufacture of sugar, and where rice hullers were seen upon every side, every one of those sugar refineries was idle except one, every one of those rice hullers was idle. Why was it? You had only to ask the men who had raised cane and rice, and they would tell you that it was due to the damming influence of the Underwood bill, which had destroyed those industries.

In all of the country round about the one factory that was running at Sugar Land, in the State of Texas, they did not raise cane sufficient to satisfy one mill and they were importing it from Cuba.

I did not believe that I would ever see the day when the leaders of the Democratic Party would confess that there was any virtue in the Payne law. Yet we see them here to-day confessing that was a most virtuous measure; all of them denouncing it then, their leaders praising it now; and we have also lived to see the day when the President of the United States, who but a few years ago, when a private citizen, said that the protective policy of the Republican Party was a crime, advocates it—fresh, if you please, from the influences surrounding

him when abroad, seeing how detrimental it is to place American labor in competition, if you please, with the cheaper labor of Europe. We have lived to see the day when the Vice President of the United States, who has also denounced the protective policy of the Republican Party on every rostrum in Indiana, admits it is a virtue and confesses that he has been wrong all these years.

The Democratic Party on this proposition is like a man riding on the train with his back to the engine. He never sees an object until he gets past it. Now the leader on the Democratic side is confessing that protection is a good thing by asserting his willingness to afford here as much protection to tungsten as was provided for it in the Payne bill, but, still blinded by the Democratic prejudice against the protective principle, is not willing to go far enough to meet the changed conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate close on the amendment and the bill in one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments close in one minute.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the motion by making it 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the motion made by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend it by making it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment that debate close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that debate close in one minute.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY] is a member of the committee and has not spoken on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that he have five minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. How much more time is there of this debate?

Mr. FORDNEY. That will make six minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman then ask for any more? It is pretty hard for some of us to sit here all day and listen to this. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I amend my motion and ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and the bill close in six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and the bill close in six minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KEARNS. I object.

Mr. FORDNEY. Then I move that all debate close in six minutes.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Did not the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that debate close in one minute prevail?

The CHAIRMAN. It did.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY], who is a member of the committee and who has not spoken to-day, be given five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY] be allowed to speak for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. One minute remains of debate upon this paragraph and the bill.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the record of this debate upon this measure would be complete without having in it the views of a Cabinet member of the present administration with reference to protective measures on this particular mineral. When in the spring of 1918 we had up under consideration the bill to appropriate \$50,000,000 to take care of the producers of tungsten and like minerals, and the hearings were being had, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lane, made the following statement to the Committee on Mines and

Mining with reference to these minerals and the need to protect the producers:

What will be the use of the money that we have or the minerals that we have? \* \* \*

We know approximately what we have. We simply want to be able to say to the small man and to the large man, "Gentlemen, go farther in and find out what you have. Bring it out, and we will see that you are not ruined by competition of foreign countries. I think that is good Americanism; I think that is common sense."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed Mr. FORDNEY and Mr. CRISP to act as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 111, noes 135.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I renew my motion that the committee do now rise and report the bill, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Goon, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4437 and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the following motion to recommit, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KITCHIN moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back instantly with the following amendments:

Strike out all of the bill after the word "namely" in line 7, page 1, and insert the following:

a. Tungsten ores of all kinds, 10 per cent ad valorem.  
b. Tungsten, tungsten powder, ferrotungsten (lump and pulverized) and ferrotungsten powder, 20 per cent ad valorem.

SEC. 3. That the provisions of any act inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to recommit I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The question was taken.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 138, nays 170, answered "present" 1, not voting 121, as follows:

YEAS—138.

Alexander	Byrns, Tenn.	Dickinson, Mo.	Harrison
Almon	Caldwell	Dominick	Hastings
Ashbrook	Cantrill	Doughton	Hayden
Aswell	Caraway	Drane	Heflin
Ayres	Carew	Dupré	Holland
Babka	Carss	Eagan	Howard
Bankhead	Clark, Fla.	Eagle	Huddleston
Barkley	Clark, Mo.	Ferris	Hudspeth
Bee	Cleary	Fisher	Hull, Tenn.
Bell	Coady	Gallagher	Igoe
Bland, Va.	Collier	Gard	Jacoway
Blanton	Connally	Garner	Johnson, Ky.
Box	Crisp	Garrett	Johnson, Miss.
Brand	Cullen	Godwin, N. C.	Jones, Tex.
Briggs	Davey	Goldfogle	Keller
Brinson	Davis, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	Kincheloe
Buchanan	Dent	Griffin	Kitchin
Byrnes, S. C.	Dewalt	Hardy, Tex.	Lanham



Lankford	Mooney	Rainey, H. T.	Thompson, Okla.
Larsen	Moore, Va.	Raker	Tillman
Lazaro	Neely	Rayburn	Upshaw
Lee, Ga.	Nelson, Mo.	Robinson, N. C.	Venable
Leshner	Nicholls, S. C.	Romjue	Vinson
Loneragan	O'Connell	Rubey	Watkins
McClintic	O'Connor	Rucker	Weaver
McDuffie	Oldfield	Sanders, La.	Webb
McGlennnon	Olney	Sears	Welling
McKeown	Overstreet	Sherwood	Welty
McKiniry	Padgett	Slms	Wilson, La.
McLane	Park	Small	Wingo
Major	Parrish	Smithwick	Woods, Va.
Mansfield	Pell	Steagall	Wright
Mays	Phelan	Stedman	Young, Tex.
Mead	Pou	Stevenson	
Minahan, N. J.	Quin	Taylor, Colo.	

## NAYS—170.

Anderson	Fuller, Mass.	Lufkin	Scott
Andrews, Md.	Glynn	Luhning	Sells
Andrews, Nebr.	Good	McArthur	Siegel
Anthony	Goodall	McCulloch	Sinclair
Bacharach	Goodykoontz	McFadden	Sinnott
Baer	Gould	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Idaho
Barbour	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Smith, Mich.
Begg	Greene, Iowa	McPherson	Snell
Benham	Greene, Vt.	MacCrate	Snyder
Bowers	Hamilton	MacGregor	Steenerson
Brooks, Pa.	Haskell	Madden	Stevens, Ohio
Browning	Hawley	Mapes	Stiness
Burdick	Hays	Martin	Strong, Kans.
Burroughs	Hernandez	Mason	Strong, Pa.
Butler	Hersey	Merritt	Summers, Wash.
Campbell, Kans.	Hersman	Michener	Sweet
Cole	Hickey	Miller	Swope
Cooper	Hoch	Mondell	Taylor, Tenn.
Crago	Houghton	Moore, Ind.	Temple
Crowther	Hullings	Morgan	Thompson, Ohio
Currie, Mich.	Hull, Iowa	Mudd	Timberlake
Curry, Calif.	Hutchinson	Murphy	Tincher
Dale	Ireland	Nelson, Wis.	Tinkham
Dallinger	James	Newton, Minn.	Towner
Darrow	Johnson, Wash.	Newton, Mo.	Treadway
Davis, Minn.	Jones, Pa.	Nichols, Mich.	Valle
Denison	Juul	Ogden	Vestal
Dowell	Kahn	Platt	Voigt
Dunbar	Kearns	Purnell	Volstead
Dyer	Kelly, Pa.	Radcliffe	Watson, Pa.
Edmonds	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey	Webster
Elliott	Klag	Ramseyer	Wheeler
Ellsworth	Kinkaid	Randall, Wis.	White, Kans.
Elston	Kieczka	Reber	White, Me.
Emerson	Knutson	Reed, W. Va.	Williams
Esch	Kraus	Rhodes	Wilson, Ill.
Evans, Nev.	Kreider	Ricketts	Winslow
Fairfield	LaGuardia	Robison, Ky.	Wood, Ind.
Fess	Lampert	Rodenberg	Yates
Focht	Langley	Sanders, Ind.	Young, N. Dak.
Fordney	Layton	Sanders, N. Y.	Zihlman
French	Lehbach	Sanford	
Fuller, Ill.	Little	Schall	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Campbell, Pa.

## NOT VOTING—121.

Ackerman	Evans, Nebr.	Linthicum	Rouse
Benson	Fields	Longworth	Rowan
Black	Fitzgerald	Luce	Rowe
Blackmon	Flood	McAndrews	Sabath
Bland, Ind.	Foster	McKenzie	Saunders, Va.
Bland, Mo.	Frear	McKinley	Scully
Boies	Freeman	Magee	Shreve
Booher	Gallivan	Maher	Sisson
Britten	Gandy	Mann	Slemp
Brooks, Ill.	Ganly	Monahan, Wis.	Smith, Ill.
Browne	Garland	Montague	Smith, N. Y.
Brumbaugh	Graham, Pa.	Moon	Steele
Burke	Greene, Mass.	Moore, Ohio	Stevens, Miss.
Candler	Griest	Moore, Pa.	Sullivan
Cannon	Hadley	Morin	Summers, Tex.
Carter	Hamill	Mott	Taylor, Ark.
Casey	Hardy, Colo.	Nolan	Thomas
Chindblom	Haugen	Oliver	Tilson
Christopherson	Hicks	Osborne	Vare
Classon	Hill	Paige	Walsh
Copley	Humphreys	Parker	Walters
Costello	Husted	Peters	Ward
Cramton	Jefferis	Porter	Watson
Dempsey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rainey, J. W.	Watson, Va.
Dickinson, Iowa	Johnson, N. Y.	Randall, Calif.	Whaley
Donovan	Kelley, Mich.	Reavis	Wilson, Pa.
Dooling	Kendall	Reed, N. Y.	Wise
Doremus	Kennedy, Iowa	Riddick	Woodyard
Dunn	Kettner	Riordan	
Echols	Kiess	Rogers	
Evans, Mont.	Len, Calif.	Rose	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. CHINDBLUM with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. GANLY.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin with Mr. CASEY.

Mr. FREAR with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. WALSH with Mr. CARTER.  
 Mr. EVANS of Nebraska with Mr. SISSON.  
 Mr. FOSTER with Mr. HUMPHREYS.  
 Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. MCANDREWS.  
 Mr. JEFFERIS with Mr. SABATH.  
 Mr. LUCE with Mr. MAHER.  
 Mr. OSBORNE with Mr. GANDY.  
 Mr. PAIGE with Mr. MOON.  
 Mr. HARDY of Colorado with Mr. BRAND.  
 Mr. MAGEE with Mr. LINTHICUM.  
 Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. GALLIVAN.  
 Mr. KIESS with Mr. SUMMERS of Texas.  
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. BENSON.  
 Mr. WARD with Mr. BLACK.  
 Mr. WALTERS with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.  
 Mr. TILSON with Mr. CANDLER.  
 Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. DONOVAN.  
 Mr. RODGERS with Mr. DOOLING.  
 Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. DOREMUS.  
 Mr. REAVIS with Mr. EVANS of Montana.  
 Mr. PORTER with Mr. FIELDS.  
 Mr. PETERS with Mr. FITZGERALD.  
 Mr. NOLAN with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.  
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. KETTNER.  
 Mr. MOORE of Ohio with Mr. LEA of California.  
 Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. MONTAGUE.  
 Mr. KENDALL with Mr. OLIVER.  
 Mr. HUSTED with Mr. RANDALL of California.  
 Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. RIORDAN.  
 Mr. GRIEST with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.  
 Mr. GARLAND with Mr. SCULLY.  
 Mr. DUNN with Mr. SMITH of New York.  
 Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. STEELE.  
 Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.  
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. THOMAS.  
 Mr. CLASSON with Mr. WATSON of Virginia.  
 Mr. ACKERMAN with Mr. WISE.

On this vote:

Mr. WHALEY (for motion to recommit) with Mr. CANNON (against).

Mr. BOOKER (for motion to recommit) with Mr. WASON (against).

Mr. HAMILL (for motion to recommit) with Mr. HADLEY (against).

Mr. BLACKMON (for motion to recommit) with Mr. MANN (against).

Mr. MOORE of Virginia (for motion to recommit) with Mr. ROWE (against).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 133, not voting 126, as follows:

## YEAS—171.

Anderson	Fairfield	Knutson	Platt
Andrews, Md.	Fess	Kraus	Purnell
Andrews, Nebr.	Focht	Kreider	Radcliffe
Anthony	Fordney	LaGuardia	Raker
Bacharach	French	Lampert	Ramsey
Baer	Fuller, Ill.	Langley	Ramseyer
Barbour	Fuller, Mass.	Layton	Randall, Wis.
Begg	Glynn	Lehbach	Reber
Benham	Good	Little	Reed, W. Va.
Bowers	Goodall	Lufkin	Rhodes
Brooks, Pa.	Goodykoontz	Luhning	Ricketts
Browning	Gould	McArthur	Riddick
Burdick	Graham, Ill.	McCulloch	Robison, Ky.
Burroughs	Green, Iowa	McFadden	Rodenberg
Butler	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, Ind.
Campbell, Kans.	Hamilton	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sanders, N. Y.
Campbell, Pa.	Haskell	McPherson	Sanford
Cole	Hawley	MacCrate	Schall
Cooper	Hernandez	MacGregor	Scott
Crago	Hersey	Madden	Sells
Crowther	Hersman	Mapes	Siegel
Curry, Calif.	Hickey	Martin	Sinclair
Dale	Hoch	Merritt	Sinnott
Dallinger	Houghton	Michener	Smith, Idaho
Darrow	Hullings	Miller	Smith, Mich.
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Iowa	Mondell	Snell
Denison	Hutchinson	Moore, Ind.	Snyder
Dowell	Ireland	Morgan	Steenerson
Dunbar	James	Mudd	Stevens, Ohio
Dyer	Johnson, Wash.	Murphy	Stiness
Edmonds	Jones, Pa.	Nelson, Wis.	Strong, Kans.
Elliott	Juul	Newton, Minn.	Strong, Pa.
Ellsworth	Kahn	Newton, Mo.	Summers, Wash.
Elston	Kearns	Nichols, Mich.	Sweet
Emerson	Kelly, Pa.	Ogden	Swope
Esch	Kennedy, R. I.	Olney	Taylor, Colo.
Evans, Nev.	Kieczka		Temple

Thompson, Ohio	Vaile	Welling	Winslow
Timberlake	Vestal	Wheeler	Wood, Ind.
Tincher	Volgt	White, Kans.	Yates
Tinkham	Volstead	White, Me.	Young, N. Dak.
Towner	Watson, Pa.	Williams	Zihlman
Treadway	Webster	Wilson, Ill.	

## NAYS—133.

Alexander	Dent	Klinchloe	Pou
Almon	Dewalt	Kitchin	Quin
Ashbrook	Dickinson, Mo.	Lanham	Rainey, H. T.
Aswell	Dominick	Lankford	Rayburn
Ayres	Doughton	Larsen	Robinson, N. C.
Babka	Drane	Lazaro	Romjue
Bankhead	Dupré	Lee, Ga.	Rubey
Barkley	Eagan	Leshner	Rucker
Bee	Eagle	Loneragan	Sanders, La.
Bell	Ferris	McClintic	Sears
Bland, Va.	Fisher	McDuffie	Sherwood
Blanton	Gallagher	McGlennon	Sims
Box	Gard	McKeown	Small
Brand	Garner	McKinley	Smithwick
Briggs	Garrett	McLane	Steagall
Brinson	Goldfogle	Major	Stedman
Buchanan	Goodwin, Ark.	Mansfield	Stevenson
Byrnes, S. C.	Griffin	Mays	Thompson, Okla.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Hardy, Tex.	Mead	Tillman
Caldwell	Harrison	Minahan, N. J.	Upshaw
Cantrill	Hastings	Mooney	Venable
Caraway	Hayden	Neely	Vinson
Carew	Heflin	Nelson, Mo.	Watkins
Carss	Holland	Nicholls, S. C.	Weaver
Clark, Fla.	Howard	O'Connell	Webb
Clark, Mo.	Huddleston	O'Connor	Welty
Cleary	Hudspeth	Oldfield	Wilson, La.
Coady	Hull, Tenn.	Oliver	Wingo
Collier	Igoe	Overstreet	Woods, Va.
Connally	Jacoway	Padgett	Wright
Crisp	Johnson, Ky.	Park	Young, Tex.
Cullen	Johnson, Miss.	Parrish	
Davey	Jones, Tex.	Pell	
Davis, Tenn.	Keller	Phelan	

## NOT VOTING—126.

Ackerman	Evans, Nebr.	King	Rose
Benson	Fields	Kinkaid	Rouse
Black	Fitzgerald	Lea, Calif.	Rowan
Blackmon	Flood	Linthicum	Rowe
Bland, Ind.	Foster	Longworth	Sabath
Bland, Mo.	Frear	Luce	Saunders, Va.
Boies	Freeman	McAndrews	Scully
Booher	Gallivan	McKenzie	Shreve
Britten	Gandy	McKinley	Sisson
Brooks, Ill.	Ganly	Magee	Slemp
Browne	Garland	Maher	Smith, Ill.
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	Mann	Smith, N. Y.
Burke	Graham, Pa.	Monahan, Wis.	Steele
Candler	Greene, Mass.	Montague	Stephens, Miss.
Cannon	Griest	Moon	Sullivan
Carter	Hadley	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Tex.
Casey	Hamill	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Ark.
Chindblom	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Tenn.
Christopherson	Haugen	Morin	Thomas
Classon	Hays	Mott	Tilson
Copley	Hicks	Nolan	Vare
Costello	Hill	Osborne	Walsh
Cramton	Humphreys	Paige	Walters
Currie, Mich.	Husted	Parker	Ward
Dempsey	Jefferis	Peters	Watson
Dickinson, Iowa	Johnson, S. Dak.	Porter	Watson, Va.
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, J. W.	Whaley
Dooling	Kelley, Mich.	Randall, Calif.	Wilson, Pa.
Doremus	Kendall	Reavis	Wise
Dunn	Kennedy, Iowa	Reed, N. Y.	Woodyard
Echols	Kettner	Riordan	
Evans, Mont.	Kiess	Rogers	

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. WASON (for) with Mr. BOOHER (against).

Mr. CANNON (for) with Mr. WHALEY (against).

Mr. HADLEY (for) with Mr. HAMILL (against).

Mr. ROWE (for) with Mr. MOORE of Virginia (against).

Mr. MANN (for) with Mr. BLACKMON (against).

Mr. McKINLEY with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that I can qualify—

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall and listening when his name was called?

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. I was not. If I were permitted to vote, however, I would ask to be recorded as "yea." Can I be recorded as "present"?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not be so recorded.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. TIMBERLAKE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—METEOROLOGICAL CONFERENCE AT PARIS (H. DOC. NO. 197).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

In view of the provision contained in the deficiency act approved March 4, 1913, that "hereafter the Executive shall not extend or accept any invitation to participate in any international congress, conference, or like event, without first having specific authority of law to do so," I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress and for its determination whether it will authorize the acceptance of the invitation and the appropriation necessary to defray the expenses incident thereto, a report from the Secretary of State with accompanying papers, being an invitation from the Government of the French Republic to that of the United States to send delegates to a proposed conference to be held at Paris on September 30, 1919, to consider questions relating to the reorganization of the service of the exchange of meteorological information, and for other purposes, and a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture showing the favor with which he views the proposed gathering, and recommending an appropriation of \$1,500 to defray the expenses of participation by at least two delegates.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

21 August, 1919.

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE OF TAGUE AGAINST FITZGERALD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in receipt of a communication from the Clerk of the House, transmitting papers in the election case of Tague against Fitzgerald. The letter, with the papers in the case, is ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Elections No. 2.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. STEVENSON, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for 10 days, on account of campaign for good-road bonds and cotton organization.

GENERAL TO THE ARMIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to present a minority report from the Committee on Military Affairs on the bill (H. R. 7595) relating to the creation of the office of general to the armies of the United States and authorizing the President to nominate to said office a general officer of the Army who within the United States and during the recent war has rendered especially distinguished service.

Mr. GARNER. What bill is that?

Mr. SANFORD. A bill to confer the grade of general on some general officer in the service within the United States.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, August 22, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules and lists of papers, documents, etc., on the files of the Treasury Department which are not needed in the transaction of public business and which have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted in conformity with the provisions of the act approved February 16, 1889, as amended (H. Doc. No. 194); to the committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting request that authority be granted to the Director of Air Service to publish and circulate at Government expense a bulletin to be issued quarterly entitled "A Bulletin of the Air Medical Service" (H. Doc. No. 195); to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the acting chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting report on the leather and shoe industries in part covering the period from 1914 to 1917, inclusive, and in part covering the period from 1914 to 1918 (H. Doc. No. 196); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GRIGSBY, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7709) to authorize the in-



incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$75,000, for the purpose of constructing and installing a municipal electric-light and power plant, and for the construction of a public-school building, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 245), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KALANIANA'OLE, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7632) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto," approved March 28, 1916, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 246), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8624) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 247), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8361) granting a pension to Samuel C. Braden; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7862) granting a pension to Harry Wetmore Miller; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6119) granting an increase of pension to Reuben S. Parker; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 8610) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Easthampton, Hampshire County, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8611) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chicopee, Hampden County, Mass., three German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8612) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Enfield, Hampshire County, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 8613) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Perry, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8614) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Alva, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8615) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Newkirk, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8616) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Cherokee, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8617) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Ponca City, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8618) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Cherokee, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8619) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fairview, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 8620) to restore to the colors and granting amnesty to soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to certain other persons; to grant additional pay to officers, enlisted men, and others who served in the armed forces of the United States in the war with Germany, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 8621) for the improvement of the Federal post-office building at Geneva, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 8622) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Sanford, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8623) for the relief of the St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 8624) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 8625) amending the shipping act approved September 7, 1916, and authorizing the sale, charter, lease, and operation of merchant vessels belonging to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 8626) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent deception with respect to cold storage and the shipment of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 8627) fixing the compensation of certain officials of the customs service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Resolution (H. Res. 253) providing for an additional messenger and assistant pair clerk for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CARSS: Resolution (H. Res. 254) requesting the President to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAYS: Memorial of the Legislature of Utah, favoring the establishment of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Utah, petitioning Congress to provide for the proper restraint, control, employment, and education of certain renegade Indians in the San Juan region of Utah; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, favoring the passage of an amendment to the bill introduced by Senator BANKHEAD in the United States Senate on December 4, 1918, known as Senate bill 5088, etc., to provide more equitable application of Federal aid for post roads in sparsely settled States, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Utah, petitioning the War Department of the United States to designate the Utah Agricultural College as a permanent site for a summer training camp of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Utah, urging the passage of a bill relating to reclamation projects for benefit of returning soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 8628) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Marquis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 8629) granting a pension to William H. Troxell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 8630) granting an increase of pension to Daniel R. Garman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8631) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. O'Harra; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 8632) granting a pension to Christiana Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 8633) granting an increase of pension to Roscoe Schutt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 8634) granting a pension to Alice May Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 8635) granting a pension to Susie Pyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 8636) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Kingsley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 8637) granting a pension to Henry S. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 8638) to utilize certain unexpended balances for the purchase of certain real estate for the Signal Service of the Army, and for the maintenance and operation thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8639) granting a pension to Harry L. Vining; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8640) granting a pension to Wesley O. Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8641) granting a pension to Elizabeth Shufelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8642) granting a pension to William H. Gross; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8643) granting a pension to Rachel J. Harlan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8644) granting a pension to Fritz Hintermeyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 8645) for the relief of Lawrence Bendich and Anthony Vezich; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 8646) granting a pension to Emma J. McCumsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 8647) for the relief of the owners of the American schooner *William H. Sumner*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 8648) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Conley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 8649) granting a pension to Hannah M. Chalmers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8650) granting a pension to F. W. Gerding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 8651) granting a pension to Thomas E. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 8652) granting a pension to Guss Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 8653) granting a pension to Laura M. Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8654) granting a pension to Ellen A. Cain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Enterprise Rebekah Lodge, No. 46, of Plymouth, N. H., favoring the adoption of the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of Local No. 205, International Molders' Union, of Newark, in favor of House bill 3149 and Senate bill 1699; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of postal employees of Boston, Mass., favoring immediate wage increase to postal workers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the women and girl workers of the Civil War, of Oakland, Calif., favoring an increase of pension for the widows of Civil War soldiers to \$35 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Sioux City Live Stock Exchange, opposing enactment of the Kenyon bill, Senate bill 2202; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the clerks and carriers of the post office at Sycamore, Ill., and resolution of the Illinois Association of Postmasters concerning increase of compensation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Joint Conference on Retirement for the Civil Service of the United States, for the Lehlbach retirement bill (H. R. 3149); to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GOULD: Petition of the postal employees of Canandaigua, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 84, to increase the salaries of postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: Resolution by the Forum of the city of Paterson, N. J., indorsing and urging legislation for the national defense through universal training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Beatrice, Nebr., urging Congress not to adopt any form of universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Archbishop Plunkett Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, urging Congress to recognize the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of W. H. Davidson, of New York City, N. Y., favoring Senate joint resolution No. 84, to increase the salaries of the postal employees 35 per cent; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of postal employees of Boston, Mass., asking for an increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of Shirt Manufacturers' Association of Philadelphia opposing formation of dye licensing commission to regulate dye imports; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of E. J. Brach & Sons, by Frank V. Brach, vice president and treasurer, Chicago, Ill., containing protest against House joint resolution 121 and Senate joint resolution 57; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Board of Trade of city of Philadelphia, by W. M. Coates, president, W. R. Tucker, secretary, protesting against Senate bill 810, entitled "A bill to establish an interstate market system, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Illinois Live Stock Association, by E. F. Keefer, secretary, Chicago, Ill., containing protest against the Kenyon and Kendrick bills; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Traffic Club of St. Louis, Mo., urging the passage of the Esch-Pomerene and Poindexter bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Railton Stillwell, Chicago, Ill., containing protest against the Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. E. Bartlett, Chicago, Ill., urging the increase of salaries of the postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Free Sewing Machine Co., Rockford, Ill., containing protest against the Nolan-Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Sioux City Live Stock Exchange, containing protest against the Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### SENATE.

FRIDAY, August 22, 1919.

Rev. John Paul Tyler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, judge of all the earth, God of our Fathers, command, we beseech Thee, upon us Thy servants this day Thy spirit of grace and wisdom, that in all that shall be done and said Thy name may be glorified. Hasten the day, we beseech Thee, when out of all the tumult and the shouting and the noise among the nations of the world the still, small voice of Thy love and wisdom shall be heard. Bless, we beseech Thee, our country, our President, the nations of the world, and grant that the day may soon come when the government of the world shall rest upon the shoulders of Him who is our Lord and King. Bless those who are sick and in distress of any kind. Bless every home in our land. Keep us true and faithful to Thee until the end, and then grant to us Thine own blessed well-done. For we ask it in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### EXTERMINATION OF COTTON-BOLL WEEVIL.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, in view of the high cost of living which is being emphasized so much now, and the imperative necessity of working and saving, I wish to present a very brief report this morning on the cotton-boll weevil. I do not ask to read it, but will print it in the Record with a short explanation.

We all know that the cotton-boll weevil has done immense damage and probably reduced the production of cotton so greatly that the product is now bringing a much higher price than it would bring if there were a large supply of it on hand.

It is thought by those who have investigated the subject carefully, and I am one of them, that a remedy for the boll-weevil pest in cotton has been discovered through a poison known as calcium arsenate, which was developed in Tallulah, La., at an experiment station there conducted for the Department of Agriculture by Mr. B. R. Coad, an able scientist, under the auspices of the Bureau of Entomology. Mr. Coad has been working at